ORIGINES CELTICAE

GUEST

OXFORD:

BY E. PICKARD HALL, M.A., AND J. H. STACY,

PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.



ORIGINES CELTICAE

(A FRAGMENT)

AND OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

TO THE

HISTORY OF BRITAIN

BY

EDWIN GUEST, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.

LATE MASTER OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1883

CONTENTS.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

Dr. Guest, who was born in 1800, was the only surviving son of Benjamin Guest, who was descended from the family of that name which was long settled at Row Heath, in the parish of King's Norton in Worcestershire, where Dr. Guest inherited a small property. The arms of the family were entered in the Herald's visitation of the time of Charles the First. Edmund Geste, who died Bishop of Salisbury in 1578, was a member of the same family. The name in former times was variously spelt Geast, Geste, Ghest, Gheast, &c., and finally took the form of Guest. In order to retrieve the failing fortunes of the family, which had become somewhat impoverished, Dr. Guest's father entered into business as a merchant, and, having by his energy and enterprise realized a considerable fortune, he retired at the close of the great war. Dr. Guest's mother was a member of the Scotch family of Rio; she died when her son was quite a child, and his affectionate and sensitive nature made him greatly feel the want of a mother's gentle and loving care.

He was educated at the Grammar School at Birmingham, of which Dr. Cook was at that time the Head Master. There he remained till he was at the head of the school, but instead of being removed elsewhere to complete his preparation for the University, he was unfortunately allowed to remain for two years longer, the lad, though fully conscious that he was wasting his time, being restrained by the habitual deference he paid to his father from venturing to place the matter before him in its true light. He however read diligently what, according to his own judgment, would be useful to him at the University, and, though there can be no doubt that had his reading during those valuable years been

more specially directed, he would have taken a higher degree than he did, yet on the other hand, the varied knowledge then accumulated may perhaps have been of service to him in after life. His drawing master was the afterwards noted painter David Cox; and, although he never subsequently cultivated the art, yet his early instruction gave him facility in drawing the rough sketches of the maps which so beautifully illustrate his historical papers.

He matriculated in 1819 at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, took his degree as eleventh wrangler, and became a Fellow of the College in 1824.

Soon after this he went abroad, and travelled for some time, principally in Germany, where he made the acquaintance of some of the noted men of the period. It was during this time that the sceptical tendencies of thought which have become of late years so prevalent in England were first forced upon his notice. He studied Hebrew with the view of satisfying his mind more fully upon certain points, and, after a lengthened period of most honest doubt and patient thought and investigation, his doubts were finally cleared away, and his faith in God's revealed Word from that time remained unshaken. In after life, during his long residence of twenty-eight years as Master of his College, 'his sound judgment and deep Christian feeling,' writes Professor Cowell, 'were invaluable; he could always be relied on; he never wavered in his convictions.'

While in Germany, he stayed for a year at Weimar, and was kindly received at the Grand Ducal Court, where he formed the acquaintance of Goethe, who did not at first think it necessary to vouchsafe the young Englishman any special mark of attention. He happened, however, one day to remark to Akermann, Goethe's secretary, that Shelley had published a translation of Faust. The remark was brought to the ears of Goethe, who expressed a strong desire to see the work. Upon this Mr. Guest at once wrote to his bookseller in London to send the book, which in due course arrived, and was presented to Goethe. 'Ah!' said the great man, highly pleased, 'this is just like those practical Englishmen; one of our good Germans would have meditated upon it for so long, and would then have taken so long to write his letter, but here (holding it up) this Englishman has got the book!' From that time forth Goethe shewed him a good deal of kindness and attention.

Mr. Guest was at Weimar when the Grand Duke's jubilee took place, in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of his reign, in September 1825. As Goethe had been the Grand Duke's Minister of Education for a similar period, so Goethe, whose jubilee of service was kept with equal pomp in the following November, shared the honours of the day. At the appointed time the Grand Duke repaired to the theatre to hear an ode written in his honour by Goethe, and recited by the principal actress of the day. As soon as this was over, all repaired to Goethe's reception. Dr. Guest used to tell how the great Meister, an exceedingly handsome man of stately presence, received his guests in a little cabinet furnished with a single rush-bottomed chair, and opening on each side into a larger reception room, he himself in perfectly plain dress with a single decoration standing to receive with an air of unstudied simplicity the brilliant throng of noble and distinguished visitors as they passed through to offer their congratulations.

With Schlegel also Mr. Guest had a considerable amount of intercourse during his residence at Bonn. They generally dined in company at the *table d'hôte* at the Golden Star, and Dr. Guest used to give an amusing account of the stately dignity with which, on entering the room, Schlegel would take off, one by one, the numerous orders and decorations with which his breast was covered, and carefully deposit them on the adjoining chimney-piece, amid the undisguised amusement of the assembled students and visitors.

On his return to England, Mr. Guest became a pupil of Mr. (afterwards Lord) Campbell, was called in due course to the bar, and entered at Lincoln's Inn, having his chambers in the Temple in King's Bench Walk.

He joined the Oxford Circuit, and continued for some time to work at his profession, but becoming gradually more and more absorbed in his own special pursuits, he finally took his name off the books.

The first result of his studies which he gave to the world was his work on English Rhythms published in 1838, in preparing the materials for which he was obliged—pioneer as he was in this branch of study—to undertake the labour, no light one, of examining for himself the manuscripts of Early English poetry, few, if any, of which had at that time been edited.

It was about this time that the idea was entertained of forming

a society for the study of Philology. Mr. Wedgwood, an original member and the first Treasurer of the Society, thus writes :—'I had several communications with Mr. Guest at the time, but the only fact I can recollect is that the formation of the Society was entirely his doing.' But though the active part of the work of founding the Society was due to him, yet Professor Key and Professor Malden were both greatly instrumental in its accomplishment. Dr. Guest received also valuable assistance from the late Dr. Arnold, who, though prevented by his duties at Rugby from taking a more active part, was always ready to help with his influence and advice. Mr. Stanley, then a Fellow of University College, since Dean of Westminster, also gave assistance by interesting the members of the sister University. The inaugural meeting of the Society took place in 1842, Dr. Guest undertaking the duties of Secretary, and the Bishop of St. David's being the first President. From time to time Dr. Guest read many valuable papers before the Society, and took an active part in its discussions.[1] One who was himself a member of the Society from its early days remembers how 'when any man failed to produce his paper, there was Guest always ready to supply his place.' The same authority also graphically describes Dr. Guest's vigorous treatment of himself, when he had on one occasion put forth what Dr. Guest considered erroneous views: 'he took me up, as a terrier does a rat, shook me well, and laid me down dead.' But though thus vigorous in discussion, it should be added that, when the heat of debate was over, it was only in accordance with his disposition to show a generous forbearance in pushing home his advantage.

During several successive years Dr. Guest's attention had been more and more directed towards the special subject of early English history, and he used to undertake long walking expeditions to examine the face of the country, and trace out the remains of ancient occupation. On these expeditions he occasionally walked as much as forty miles a day. Often he went right ahead over hedges and ditches and through tangled copsewood, to follow the course of some faint vestiges of dyke or boundary, taking for guide sometimes a labourer from an adjoining village, some-

[1] A complete list of Dr. Guest's philological papers is given in the Appendix to English Rhythms.

times one whom he shrewdly suspected to be a poacher, who knew every turn and corner of the surrounding country. 'Uncommonly clever fellows' he sometimes found these guides, entering with intelligent interest into the object of his search, and beguiling the way by their graphic sketches and racy remarks on men and passing events. Very dirty and dusty he was returning one day from an expedition of this kind, when turning into the village he met two clergymen. They recognized him, for Dr. Guest caught the look and tone of astonishment with which one exclaimed in an undertone 'That's the master of Caius'—the quick glance round and the further remark 'Yes, that's *he*.' 'No wonder they were astonished,' he said, 'seeing me in such a dirty condition, and in company, I have little doubt, of one of the black sheep of their flock.' These investigations thus pursued contributed an important element to his literary workmanship. For it was a special feature of Dr. Guest's system of studying the events of our ancient history that he in all cases, as a preliminary step, made a most careful and patient survey, not only of the precise locality concerned, but also of all the geographical circumstances and the natural features of the surrounding district which could in any way affect the course of historical events. And this was no doubt one of the causes which made the ultimate decision at which in any such case he might arrive, one invariably received with the utmost respect.

As an illustration of his method in thus going to work it may be mentioned that before writing his paper on the 'Landing of Julius Caesar in Britain,' which was read before the Archaeological Institute in 1864, he, having already made a most careful survey on the English side, spent many days in investigating the opposite coast of France, and in scientifically calculating the possible changes caused by time and tide, which, more especially on the English side, owing to the great changes which have taken place in the coast, proved so considerable as to form a most important element in the solution of the problem.

The following appreciative review of Dr. Guest's literary career is from a letter written to the 'Spectator' by Mr. E. A. Freeman, shortly after Dr. Guest's death :—

'Mr. Finlay was the man who first taught Englishmen the importance of the Eastern Empire in the history of the world. Dr.

Guest did for them the almost greater service of revealing the first stages of their own history in the Isle of Britain.

'That the general public should know little of Dr. Guest is neither wonderful nor blameworthy. No one so carefully hid his light under a bushel. His love of certainty and accuracy was almost morbid. Had he been content to risk a few mistakes, he would have done more good. A book, even though its first edition contained some things which needed to be corrected in the second, might have established his fame,—which he, perhaps, would not have cared for; it would certainly, what he surely would have cared for, have conveyed clear views of our early history to many whom clear views have not yet reached.

'I believe Dr. Guest had actually begun, or at least contemplated, a book. Scholars would be delighted to know that there are some available materials left behind him. But what we actually have, later than the "English Rhythms," is that wonderful series of discourses—more than one, happily, but still too few—made before successive meetings of the Archaelogical Institute, in which the progress of English conquest in the southern part of Britain was first really set forth. No lecturer, no writer, was ever more clear and convincing than Dr. Guest. He was the exact parallel in his own subject to Professor Willis in his subject. They both united, as few men have united, the qualifications of the in-door scholar and of the out-door antiquary. Each of them had in his own department both read everything and seen everything, and each knew how to compare what he read with what he saw. Both belonged to that class of revealers of truth who bring order out of chaos and light out of darkness, who do their work at the first blow, so that it needs not to be done again. When any of us who have come after them have ventured on the ground which they have trodden, it has been only to gather up the gleanings from their vintage.

'Yet the name of this illustrious scholar is hardly known. It is not likely to be known. Dr. Guest's few scattered papers are worth a library. But who is likely to know of a few scattered papers? Dr. Guest ranks with Palgrave and Kemble. Whenever they meet on the same ground, he ranks above Palgrave and Kemble. Neither Palgrave nor Kemble is, I fancy, known as he ought to be; but Guest is far less known than either. But my own

homage I must pay. There are other scholars from whom I may have learned more in quantity, because their writings cover a greater field; but there is none from whom I have learned more in quality, none from whom I have, within his own range, taken in so many thoughts which were absolutely new, but which, when they were once taken in, I never thought of disputing. I believe that I have always acknowledged—I have at least always tried to acknowledge—the depth of my own obligations to so honoured a master. Yet it has often happened to me—it must have happened to others who have worked at the same times—to find shallow and hasty critics sometimes admiring, sometimes jeering at, the thoughts of the teacher, as if they have been the thoughts of the learner.

'It must now be not far short of thirty years—twenty-eight, I think, is the exact measure—since Dr. Guest was chosen Master of his College. There was some dispute at the time, uninteresting and almost unintelligible outside the College, but which, like other things, made its way into the newspapers. Both the "English Rhythms" and some of his papers had already appeared, yet some foolish man wrote of Mr. Guest as one "known only from the 'Cambridge Kalendar.'" I remember writing a little letter to say what injustice was thus done to one from whom I had even then learned much. I certainly hoped then that in all those years some great work would have been forthcoming from his hand. Unhappily it has not been so. It is little indeed in amount that Dr. Guest has left behind him. But that little is all of the purest gold.'

Dr. Guest was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1839; in 1852 he was made an honorary Member of the Society of Antiquaries, and in 1853 he was admitted D.C.L. *ad eundem* at Oxford. A few years after the death of his father, which took place in 1843, he bought an estate at Sandford, in Oxfordshire, but he had scarcely settled down in his new home, when, the Mastership of Caius College having become vacant by the death of Dr. Chapman, he was elected to the vacant post, though he was not a candidate, and was even unaware of the kind intention of his friends to nominate him until they were just about to enter the college chapel for the purpose of voting. This was in 1852. Dr. Guest retained the Mastership until a few weeks before his death. This is not the place to dwell on the stormy history of the University during these

eight and twenty years; of Dr. Guest's share and interest in Cambridge life, one of his friends[1] writes as follows :—'Although Dr. Guest was well known among us for his great literary attainments, he was but occasionally resident in the University until he became Master of his College in 1852. It was about that time that the commissioners appointed under Lord John Russell's auspices for enquiring into the condition of the University and Colleges, issued their report, and it was in 1855, when Dr. Guest was Vice-Chancellor of the University, that a bill was brought in for giving effect to that report. Accordingly Dr. Guest had many opportunities of forming and expressing his opinion on the numerous changes which were projected by the commissioners affecting the constitution of the University and Colleges. On every public occasion that the changes in question were subject to his consideration Dr. Guest proved himself to be an unvacillating conservative. In his private capacity as Master of the College Dr. Guest secured a lasting reputation for kindheartedness and general urbanity among a large circle of members of the University, whilst to his more intimate friends, he was endeared by his unaffected personal piety, and by the general benevolence of his disposition which manifested itself in his liberal support of those many religious and charitable institutions and societies which have for their object the promulgation of Scriptural truth and the moral improvement of mankind.' His time was afterwards spent in term-time at Cambridge, and during the vacation principally at Sandford. While at home his recreation from literary pursuits was in building and restoring the farmhouses and cottages. He was his own architect, and had the work carried on under his own inspection, and thoroughly well done. He had a strong feeling that great responsibility attaches to landlords to have good and sufficient accommodation of every kind for their poorer tenants. Country life too was the more congenial to him from the great interest which he took in natural history and the habits and instincts of living creatures.

He was pricked to serve the office of High Sheriff of his county in 1855. He felt however that his duties as Master of his College, more especially at a time when great changes were impending and his presence was necessary at constantly recurring meetings, as well also

[1] Dr. Corrie, Master of Jesus College.

as the Vice-Chancellorship of the University, which he was elected to fill at that time, were quite incompatible with those of High Sheriff, and he appealed to the Privy Council for exemption. The case, which excited some passing interest at the time, was argued before Baron Parke and Baron Alderson, and the appeal was successful.

Dr. Guest's character was marked by great firmness and resolution, and unflinching honesty to his convictions. His naturally cautious temperament made him slow in forming his judgment, but when his mind was made up, and he saw where duty lay, nothing could shake him. He had a great fund of general information, and as he had seen a good deal of life, and had met many men of note, both at home and abroad, he was a very interesting companion. At the same time he threw himself into the interests and pursuits of those around him. One of his country friends writes :—'I have ever appreciated the genial heartiness with which Dr. Guest always received me, and the kindly interest which he took in my pursuits, so very different from his own; and I can judge from this how the same kindly spirit must have endeared him to those with whom he lived.'—This was truly so.

In 1859 he married Anne, daughter of Mr. Joseph Ferguson, of Carlisle (which city Mr. Ferguson for some time represented in Parliament), and widow of Major Banner, 93rd Highlanders.

In 1873 he had a slight attack of paralysis which occasioned a numbness of one hand and arm, and which never quite passed away. His health from that time became gradually more enfeebled, and in July, 1879, he was attacked with severe illness. As soon as he had somewhat recovered he resigned the Mastership of Caius College in October 1880.

Shortly afterwards his illness returned with renewed force, and on November the 23rd he died.

During this long and very trying illness the faith, which had been his guiding principle through life, cheered and sustained him, and his last words were words of humble confidence and trust in Christ.

A. G.

SANDFORD PARK,
April 14, 1882.

Any sketch, however slight, of Dr. Guest's literary and archaeological labours would be conspicuously incomplete which failed to give a prominent place to those undertaken by him in connexion with the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. It was at the annual meetings of the Institute that he delivered these epoch-making discourses on the early history of our country which have justly obtained for him the character, given by a great living authority as 'the discoverer of Early English history,' and it was in the publications issued by that body, at first in the 'Proceedings' of their annual meetings, and, when the publication of those volumes was discontinued, in the *Archaeological Journal*, that these brilliant disquisitions, delivered orally, with only the help of a few notes, were given to the world.

As one of the, alas, few remaining members of the Archaeological Institute, who had the privilege of being eye and ear witnesses of many of these marvellously creative discourses, to whom the deep sounds of his sonorous voice are still audible, and who still remember how their interest was enhanced by the kindling eye, the firm-set lip, the expressive gestures, while, as warming with his theme, he paced before his huge map, leading his hearers on step by step to the conclusion he had arrived at, and enabling them to realize it with the perfect conviction of a certain truth; as one, I say, whose memory of these golden hours, only too few and too far between, is most vivid, and who also for many years enjoyed the privilege of intimate acquaintance with this illustrious scholar, the task has been assigned me of drawing up some account of his connexion with the Archaeological Institute, and of the circumstances of the delivery of the discourses on which his reputation as an historian mainly rests. I could have wished that the duty had been entrusted to some one better qualified to do justice to the theme; but the quarter from which the request that I would undertake it has come, and the terms in which it has been couched, have left me no choice, and I have had a sad but very real pleasure in recalling those far-off days of happy association for the pursuit of archaeological science and the discovery of hidden truth, with that gifted band who illustrated the early years of the Archaeological Institute, the majority belonging to the University of which the late Master of Caius was one of the most distinguished members.

The discourses to which I have referred, as delivered before the

Archaeological Institute at their annual meetings, and afterwards published by that body, may be not untruly said to have first made Dr. Guest known to the literary world as an historian. His celebrity as a philologist was already of long standing. As secretary of the Philological Society, of which I believe he was one of the founders, and a frequent contributor to its Journal, he had done much towards the establishment of sound principles of philological science and accurate criticism, as well as for the elucidation of many obscure points in the history of the English and cognate tongues. His 'History of English Rhythms'—'unhappily,' to quote Mr. Freeman, 'the only book strictly so called which that great scholar put forth[1]'—had proclaimed his consummate knowledge of the structure of our Early English language and its literature. But as an historian he was still unknown, except to a limited circle, and the still greater reputation which has gathered round his name in this department had yet to be acquired. The readers of his 'English Rhythms,' necessarily a select few, could not fail to recognize the masterly grasp he had taken of the events, no less than of the speech, of the early ages of England, of which his intimate and intelligent acquaintance with these far-off and obscure times was no secret to his friends and associates. Some could also bear witness by personal companionship in such investigations, to the untiring zeal and determination with which, careless of weather, or hunger, or any physical inconveniences, he would walk mile after mile with a keenness of perception almost amounting to an instinct, tracing the lines of ditch and bank which marked the boundaries of the settlements of the early tribes, and measuring and mapping the earthworks which formed their places of shelter and defence; and how under his potent touch these mysterious remains became vocal with the history of the past. But it was only to a select and privileged circle these things were known. Had not the Archaeological Institute, adopting the recently conceived plan of the British Association, by its annual meetings in different archaeological centres, afforded Dr. Guest the opportunity of bringing to bear upon successive districts his unrivalled historical acumen and keen sense of the effect produced by the local configurations of a county on the fortunes of its occupants, the world at large, to its great loss, might probably have continued in ignorance of Dr. Guest's powers in this department of

[1] Freeman, *Hist. of Norman Conquest*, vol. v. p. 506, note.

research. The results of his researches, instead of enriching all future ages, might have remained locked up in his own note-books. Among the many grounds the Archaeological Institute has established on the gratitude of those who desire to know the true history of the past, how men spoke, built, and wrought in former ages, who they were, whence they came, where they dwelt, and what they did, not the least is that it gave the occasion for the production of those dissertations which have once for all settled up so many controverted points, cleared up so many obscurities, and by changing vagueness into definiteness, substituting historical certainties for plausible theories, have laid down a solid foundation which all who have since then attempted to write intelligently the early history of our country, have built on with thankful confidence.

After a single year of combined existence under the title of the 'Archaeological Association,' the Archaeological Institute began its career as a separate and independent society at the meeting held at Winchester in 1845, under the presidency of the Marquis of Northampton. The name of 'Edwin Guest, Esq., F.R.S., Secretary to the Philological Society,' is found on the Committee of the Historical Section, of which Mr. Hallam the historian was president, together with that of his fellow-worker in the field of Early English history, the lamented John Mitchell Kemble. Mr. Kemble contributed a very interesting paper on 'the Names, Surnames, and Nicnames of the Anglo-Saxons,' printed in the volume of Transactions for that year; but the name of Mr. Guest does not appear either as the reader of a paper or as taking any part in the discussions at the various sectional or general meetings. Indeed I am not absolutely certain that he attended the meeting. I cannot remember seeing him. The second meeting was held at York in 1846. In this Mr. Guest held his former position on the Committee of the Section of History, the late Mr. Thomas Stapleton being president, but as at Winchester he was a silent member. The only occasion on which his name appears in the records of the meeting is as seconding a vote of thanks proposed by Dr. Plumptre, the former Master of University College, Oxford.

At the meetings at Norwich in 1847, and at Lincoln in 1848, Mr. Guest's name again appears on the Historical Committee. At the former meeting he for the first time became one of the governing body of the Institute as a member of the Central Council.

Neither of the meetings, however, was enriched by any communication from him, nor as far as I can trace did he join in any of the discussions. Nor is there anything surprising in this. Those who knew him well remember how unwilling Dr. Guest was at all times to enter on controverted topics in the heat of extemporaneous debate, or to express an opinion on any point of history or philology unless he had made himself perfectly sure of his ground by previous preparation. The attempt to extort an opinion from him was, as I have often witnessed, repeatedly made, but as repeatedly baffled. With perfect courtesy, but with immoveable decision, he would put aside the questions of his interrogators, and absolutely decline to give any answer to their enquiries unless he could return one which he knew to be absolutely correct. If the result of this caution was frequent disappointment to those who had looked forward to learning much on disputed points from a few hours spent in his company, the cause of exact science was promoted thereby, since no hasty, unweighed statements went out under the sanction of his great name, and his slightest words were felt to be the fruit of long and careful consideration, and of accurately weighed evidence. Few scholars have had occasion to retract so little, because few have ever spoken or written with so much caution and judgment.

It was at the fifth of the annual meetings of the Institute, that held at Salisbury in 1849, that Dr. Guest commenced that marvellous series of historical discourses which have caused his name to be known and honoured among all students of our early history, and which he continued at intervals until advancing years rendered him incapable of the intellectual and physical effort necessary for their composition and delivery. The subject of this discourse was 'The Early English Settlements in South Britain.' It was delivered in the Council Chamber, the one man in England possessed of knowledge and genius comparable to his own, the late John Mitchell Kemble, occupying the presidential chair. It is impossible to describe the effect this discourse produced. The lecturer, not reading from a manuscript in measured tones, but pouring forth his concentrated stores of knowledge orally, with the enthusiasm of one fully possessed with his subject, and the accuracy of perfect acquaintance with every detail, literally held his hearers entranced. To not a few—certainly to myself—the lecture was simply a revela-

tion. The 'battles of kites and crows,' as Milton contemptuously termed the conflicts of the early occupants of our island, commonly compressed into the half-dozen opening pages of our English histories, had failed to awaken any vivid interest. A few names of persons and places, uncertain and semi-mythical, haunted our memories, but of any definite history of that hazy period, if indeed any such could be said to exist, the majority were entirely ignorant. Never can I forget the rapt attention with which the lecturer was listened to as he evolved the history contained in local names, made us actually see first the vast unbroken woodland—the *Andred* or uninhabited district—which covering the hills of Kent and Sussex and stretching into Hampshire completely isolated the southern districts of these counties—shewed us the true signification of the Saxon shore, i.e. not the coast occupied by the Saxon pirates, but that infested by them—brushed away with masterly hand the objections to the authenticity of Gildas, and established the historical personality of Hengest and Horsa—shewed how the conquest of Kent was the result of a single victory; how Regnum was taken through a panic, and as the modern Chichester (Cissa-ceaster) has preserved the name of the son and successor of the founder of the South Saxon kingdom, consolidated by the destruction of Anderida and the extermination of the British inhabitants; and then, moving westwards, traced the slow growth of the mighty kingdom of Wessex, destined eventually to absorb all its best kingdoms, telling the long story of the gradual encroachments of the conquerors on the native tribes retiring step by step, only yielding up their territory after bloody defeats, the battles of Charford, and Badbury, and Barbury and Old Sarum, within a mile or two of the place of our meeting, until the decisive battle of Deorham sealed the fate of South Britain, and the Weals, severed from one another by the broad expanse of the Severn Sea, were finally cooped up among the mountain ridges of Wales, or in the peninsula of Cornwall. Brilliant as was the lecture that succeeded on the 'History and times of Becket and the Constitutions of Clarendon,' from Mr. Kemble, its power and eloquence were inadequate to lessen the impression Mr. Guest had produced by his discourse which to many of his hearers formed an epoch in their lives. I was cognisant of the impression made by Mr. Guest's discourse on Mr. Kemble himself, for I was staying in the same hotel with him, and I can well remember the

admiration which, while strongly dissenting from some of his conclusions, especially that about the 'Saxon shore,' he expressed for the breadth and accuracy of knowledge it displayed, and the envy he felt for his brother historian's intimate acquaintance with Welsh language and literature, 'In other things I am not the least afraid of him ; but there he beats me.'

The next year, 1850, the Institute met at Oxford, and Mr. Guest again delivered a discourse, following the same line of investigation he had opened at Salisbury, but adapting it to a still earlier period, that anterior to the occupation of our island by the Romans. The title of his paper 'On the Belgic Ditches and the probable date of Stonehenge' indicates its subject. I was not fortunate enough to hear it, having to make my choice between the Historical and Architectural section, which were sitting at the same time. It strikes me, on perusal, as scarcely so brilliant as its predecessor, but it was hardly a less valuable contribution to early history, and its conclusions, as to the limits of the Belgic settlements and Old Sarum having been their capital, have, I believe, been accepted by all subsequent writers of authority. The date of Stonehenge, conjecturally assigned by him to the southern Belgae not long before Divitiacus became supreme ruler, must still be, and will, I suppose, ever remain a point of controversy. The subject of the Saxon Conquest of Western Britain, which he had made so completely his own, was continued by Mr. Guest in a memoir communicated to the Historical Section of the Institute at the Bristol meeting in the following year, 1851.

Dr. Guest's name does not appear in the reports of the meetings at Newcastle in 1852, or at Chichester in 1853, and, as far as I can remember or gather from others, he seems not to have been present at either. In the former year Mr. Guest had succeeded Dr. Chapman as Master of Caius, and probably found the duties of the new and important position to which he had been so unexpectedly called, sufficient to engage his whole time. One happy result of his appointment as Head of a House was that when the Institute met in 1854 at Cambridge, Dr. Guest was on the spot to aid his brother archaeologists with his counsel and co-operation, as president of the Historical Section, and to make an important contribution to the proceedings of the Congress. The most distinguished assemblage probably ever gathered at an Institute

meeting was that held in the Senate House on the 5th of July, at which the Prince Consort, in his capacity of Chancellor of the University, was present, having travelled from London with his suite for the express purpose of showing his interest in and value for the objects of the Institute. On this remarkable occasion one of the two discourses delivered—the other being one from Professor Willis on 'the architectural history of the Collegiate Buildings'—was by Dr. Guest, on 'the four great Boundary Dykes of Cambridgeshire, and the probable date of their construction.' Much of the information contained in this discourse was subsequently embodied in the memoirs on the Ancient Roads, popularly but incorrectly known as the 'Four Roman Ways,' the Watling-street, the Fosse-way, the Icknield-street, and the Erming-street, which was delivered by Dr. Guest at the meeting in Edinburgh in 1856, and printed in the Journal for June, 1857.

The meeting at Bath in 1858 was signalized by the production of another of Dr. Guest's most important contributions to the history of the English Conquest of the Western Counties: the Memoir on Boundary Lines which separated the Welsh and English races in that vicinity between the capture of Bath following on the decisive battle of Deorham, A. D. 577, 'one of those events which change the fortunes of a people,' and the victory 'at the Pens,' A. D. 658, a place probably to be identified with Pen-Selwood near Wincanton, which finally drove the Welsh beyond the Parret, and made the greater part of Somersetshire English. One characteristic of this remarkable memoir is the manner in which local nomenclature was made subsidiary to history, in determining the boundaries of the contending races: such names as Englishcombe, and Englishbatch, and Inglebourne, and the like, marking the settlements of the conquerors, while Wallscombe and Wallsmeade indicate those of the conquered, and Mere and Merkbury, the burgh or fortress of the March (like Devizes, *ad Divisas*, far away to the north-east), shew where the boundary line ran. I well remember the delight expressed by my friend Mr. E. A. Freeman when Dr. Gue t having laid down that the boundary between the Welsh and English south of Bath must have run along the little river Axe, which was the boundary of his own property to the north, he discovered that he was actually living on what in the sixth century had been Welsh ground, and saw the reason for his estate of Somerleaze being

included in the parish of St. Cuthbert's Wells, rather than in that of Wookey, the church of which was within a gunshot of his house but on the other side of the streamlet.

The subject of the Bath discourse was pursued with still more important results in the discourse on the 'English Conquest of the Severn Valley' delivered by him at the Gloucester meeting in 1860, and published in the Journal of September 1862. The printed memoir conveys but little idea of the brilliancy of the discourse as orally delivered, and fails altogether to reproduce the almost breathless interest with which Dr. Guest carried his audience with him in his investigation of the site of Ceawlin's battle, at 'Fethan-leag,' A.D. 584, rejecting one assumed locality after another, as he led them up the Severn valley, until he at last fixed it by convincing arguments, at the village of Faddiley, at the entrance of the Vale Royal of Cheshire. Llywarch Hen's elegy on Kyndylan, and his lamentation over the wreck of Bassa's church (now Baschurch in Shropshire) and the conflagration of Uriconium (Wroxeter) 'the white town in the valley' reads tamely on the printed page. We sorely miss the deep sonorous voice and the flashing eye which made it so real and vivid.

In the last two discourses with which Dr. Guest enriched the proceedings of the Institute, he selected an earlier period for his historical and topographical investigations than in any of his former papers. Both of these—that delivered at Rochester in July, 1863, and that delivered at the London meeting in July, 1866—had reference to the Roman invasion of Britain; the former to the 'Places of embarkation and landing of Julius Caesar,' the latter to the 'Campaign of Aulus Plautius under the Emperor Claudius.' In both of these discourses, as in the former ones relating to the English Conquest, Dr. Guest rewrote in legible characters, some obscure and half effaced pages of our early history, and by his marvellous topographical insight established with all the certainty attainable, the most important events and localities of these campaigns. The cause which at this time led Dr. Guest to desert his special field of investigation was the interest which was then being so strangely excited by the announcement of the intention of the late Emperor of the French to publish a biography of Julius Caesar, on the preparation of which he had been for a considerable period engaged. It is a striking evidence of the widespread reputation

of Dr. Guest as the chief English authority on all questions of historical topography, that the late Emperor on being informed, during his absence from Paris in the provinces, that it was Dr. Guest's intention to discuss the vexed question of the place of Julius Caesar's first landing in Britain, at the Rochester meeting, deputed his private librarian, M. Alfred Maury, Member of the Institute of France, to attend the meeting, and transmit to him an accurate report of Dr. Guest's views on the subject. By some mishap or defective information, M. Maury did not arrive till two days after the delivery of the discourse. Dr. Guest, however, devoted a considerable time to the private exposition of his views, and the explanation of his conclusions to M. Maury. 'It won't suit the Emperor,' was the Secretary's laconic remark when the explanation came to a close. Referring the reader to the paper itself, it is enough here to say that Dr. Guest has convincingly proved that the port of Wissant was that from which Caesar set sail, and that he landed on some point of the marshy coast in the vicinity of Deal. The subject of the second paper, that on the 'Campaign of Aulus Plautius,' though so important in its results, is one which has received but little attention from historians. It was one, therefore, which afforded Dr. Guest the opportunity of exhibiting his marvellous genius, as 'the discoverer,' almost 'the creator' of the early history of Britain; and thus it appropriately, though prematurely, for the work which still remained to be done in the province he had made so peculiarly his own, closes the series.

E. V.

THE PRECENTORY, LINCOLN.

THE work which fills the first and half the second of the two volumes before us, is unhappily only a fragment,—a fragment of a section of a great design. Under the title 'Origines Celticae' we have attempted to arrange and prepare for publication the chapters on early ethnology which Dr. Guest intended for the introduction to a work which, coming from his hands, would have been invaluable. His purpose would seem to have been to write the history of Britain and its inhabitants until the completion of the conquest by the Angles and Saxons. The historical papers which have been described above are sketches or studies of what would have been the

later portions of his book. In the 'Origines Celticae' we have an attempt made to trace the earliest known inhabitants of our island, through the prehistoric times, in their progress from the original home of our race to their settlement in Britain. This was to be done by a careful and discriminating examination of geographical names, mythological traditions, and ethnological associations, coupled with bold and ingenious speculations in philology and the interpretation of ancient monuments. By a combination of laborious study with brilliant conjecture, the writer thought it possible to identify, under the varied nomenclature of the ancient geographers, not only the nation to whose history he was devoting himself, but the several steps of its movements westward. It was a task full of difficulty, and one that involved great temptation to digression. The examination of the traces of Cimmerii, Iberes and Ligues, in the first three chapters, led to a discursive exploration of the difficulties of scriptural ethnology, and thence to those points of still remoter archaeology which carry us to Egypt, Phoenicia, and Assyria, biblical chronology, and the interpretation of hieroglyphics. A chapter on the populations of Thrace, Asia Minor, Greece and Italy, again brings us westward, but only to fall back on questions of the same kind, all centering in the primitive ethnography of the Scriptures. The transition from these speculations to the subject of letter-changes and linguistic affinities enables us to return to the original current of thought exhibited in the chapter on the Belgae, which ends the first volume.

The portion of the work contained in the second volume comprises a fragmentary examination, beginning from the other extreme end of the string, of the historical, legendary, and fabulous traditions which are found within Britain itself. This was to have been followed by a careful investigation of archaeological remains, walls, and other buildings, hut circles, religious and other monuments, arms, furniture, manners and customs, which would have given flesh and blood, life and movement, to the otherwise shadowy personalities which the writer would have presented to us. Unfortunately the materials left for this portion of the design consist only of notes from books, references and extracts, which could not with any advantage be arranged, even conjecturally, for a continuation of the plan. The second section of the 'Origines Celticae' is therefore, still more than the first, a fragment of a fragment.

We may infer from this very brief outline that the author's intention was to bring together two or more converging lines or chains of arguments: in the first place gathering and formulating, from external archaeology, a number of links of reasoning to form a theory which in the second place was to be completed, strengthened, and supplemented by a corresponding chain of arguments from domestic and internal evidence. The Cimmerii and the Ligures of the outside world were to be identified with, or distinguished from, the Cambrians and Lloegrians of Celtic legend, and the lines drawn that connect or separate the Britons and the Basques. Here however, unfortunately, we lose the guidance of the master's hand. We have the links of his chain of argument, but the penetrating genius that would connect them and make them conclusive is withdrawn. The several stones of the fabric that was to have been, are hewn and squared, but the plan that was to have given them unity is wanting. This disheartening imperfection belongs more or less to all unfinished work posthumously given to the world; but it is very conspicuous in the present case. For part of Dr. Guest's method was to present his result almost by way of surprise. He did not intend that his conclusion should thrust itself on the eye from the beginning of the investigation, but that the several points of his theory having been elucidated and illustrated definitely by themselves, the perfection of the argument should reveal itself only at the moment of completion. This is apparent in the historical papers which follow the 'Origines Celticae,' although, as they were prepared for an audience which was to follow them to their full development, each possesses a completeness of its own. But in any such plan it is obvious that the temptations to digression multiply as the investigation proceeds, and that the investigator himself, having full faith in his own system, sees in them only new methods of illustrating the point at which he is certain of arriving. Again we have to lament the withdrawal of the hand which would have guided us through the digressions, as well as have given point and clearness to the conclusion.

Notwithstanding, however, this drawback, the speculations on early ethnology have so much freshness, learning, command of illustration and genius for conjecture, that they inspire the reader with an independent interest of their own, and he is quite content to follow the Cimmerii, the Ligues, the Iberes, and the Belgae

through their migrations and transmigrations, irrespective of the feeling that he may be hunting up the relics of his own ancestry. Although the work is thus in one aspect most imperfect, as wanting the unity of design which completion alone could give it, it must be added that no portion of it was by itself written hurriedly or without a view to its bearing on the whole. Nearly every page here given to the public was written, revised, copied out, and often revised again and copied again; we have every reason to believe that it contained the mature judgment and final opinion of the writer.

The extreme care with which Dr. Guest elaborated the several steps of his work leads us to regret more signally the imperfect state in which he left a large portion of the first volume. His original fourth chapter, which was to have contained an examination of the history of the military races of the early world, had been written out, revised, and re-copied, when he determined to break it up into smaller sections and re-write them. Whilst he was engaged in this reconstruction, his powers of work failed; part of the design was attempted, and the plan of the remainder was drawn in outline. But as he proceeded he destroyed the earlier sheets, and this in some places where they must have contained matter additional to that which he expanded in re-writing. This has caused some difficulty of arrangement; and it has been thought safer to retain repetitions of even verbal argument in several places, to some of which they belonged in the earlier, and to some in the later draft. It has also, it is much to be feared, caused here and there a hiatus in the text, and the loss of a subordinate link in the argument. Wherever this is clearly the case attention has been called to the fact in the notes, but the character of Dr. Guest's method, which is indicated above, greatly increases the probability that some such imperfect and disconnected places may have been overlooked. Anyhow, as the first draft had been destroyed, and the second was never completed, it was impossible to reproduce a perfect arrangement. All that is to be found is given entire.

The task of editing these sheets has not been an easy one, for it involved the verification of a very large number of references to books of which many editions had been used, and some of which were not easy of access. It is hoped that as no labour has been spared in this behalf, the result may be satisfactory to scholars who will use the book, and who know the difficulty of perfect exactness

in such verifications. No attempt has been made, and it would obviously have been most imprudent to attempt it, to manipulate the argument, or to interfere in the slightest degree with the language of the work. It appears exactly as it left Dr. Guest's hands, except in the matter of references and a few indications, in the notes, of the places where the argument is resumed, repeated, or referred to.

It was perhaps rash to undertake the publication of a work written by a friend with whom we were not in continuous intercourse, which was only half completed, and which, from the peculiarity of its construction, did not help us much in the work of redaction. But if the editors must plead guilty to a charge of temerity, they may confidently assert the integrity of the text for which they are responsible. The work itself was one which could be completed, could be adequately presented only by the author, to whose clear head and steady eye the idea that he had conceived was constantly and distinctly present. Whilst it desiderates the want of completion, the world may still find pleasure in examining the points which deep learning and thorough enthusiasm, acute insight, unsparing labour, and a lavish genius of εὐστοχία have done so much to illustrate. To Dr. Guest's many friends it will be a source of mingled pleasure and regret; and whatever judgment they may form upon the countless subjects touched on in the course of argument, they will be glad to renew acquaintance with him through a work which bears so characteristic an impress of his genius, his faith, and his devout labour.

W. STUBBS.
C. DEEDES.

KETTEL HALL,
April 17, 1882.

CHAPTER I.

Western Europe, its earliest occupants, Basques, Fins, or Celts? — Gomer and his sons; their history as gathered from the Bible. — The Kimmerioi of the Odyssey; their connexion with 'the Nekuia' of Homer; the difficulties thence arising considered; reasons for believing that Celtic races were settled in the districts with which the name of Kimmerioi is connected. — The Sikeloi the most ancient people of southern and central Italy; their expulsion as related by Dionysius; the Kimmerioi, whom Ephorus locates at the Avernus, were Sikeloi left behind in the Peninsula, and must have been Celts from the topography of the country; Sikeloi found on both sides of the Adriatic; the people of Buchaetium in Epirus, living near the Kheimerion promontory, referred to in legend as Sikeloi; traces of Celtic topography in other parts of Greece. — The Kimmerioi of Herodotus passed from the Crimea into Asia, and kept it in disquiet for some centuries; the story of the Greek historian in perfect agreement with Scripture. — The story of an invasion of Aeolia and Ionia by the Kimmerioi *before* the time of Homer, probably originated in some blundered account of the invasion mentioned by Herodotus.

The views entertained by Josephus with respect to the descendants of Gomer are valuable, but require correction; the Togarmah of Scripture the Trocmoi of Grecian history; Riphath, the Bebrukes inhabiting the Rhebantian district east of the Bosphorus; Ashkenaz, the men inhabiting Arzanēne at the sources of the Tigris, *not* the Askania either of Homer or of Strabo. — The Askanios, Otreus, and Mugdōn of Homer mere appellatives; his knowledge of the Celtic tribes of Asia confined to those settled on the southern coast of the Euxine, and those dwelling on the frontiers of Lydia. — Origin of the name Phruges; the name first adopted by such of the native tribes as were struggling against the intrusive races who had seized on the coast districts; applied in a later age to all the cognate races. — Certain of the Kimmerioi called Kerberioi; the name originated in the volcanic region of Phrygia; in later times was used like the term Phruges, as a mere synonym for Kimmerioi. — The Celts distinguished for their worship of the infernal gods; Serapis, the great idol of Alexandria, came from the Celtic district of Paphlagonia. — Tartaros and the Titan gods located by the Greeks in the western districts among the Celts.

The name of Keltoi (Celts) took its rise in the neighbourhood of Marseilles; first given by the civilized natives to the ruder tribes of the woodland districts; then extended to the kindred races; transferred in the latter half of the second century to the uncivilized Germans beyond the

Rhine. — Celtic tribes passed the Alps in the fifth century B.C., and settled in the valley of the Po; called themselves men of the Gal or Plain (Galli); the name transferred by Caesar and his contemporaries to the related tribes living north of the Alps, who were previously strangers to it; became at length a general name for the race. — Caesar's Gallia parcelled out between three races, the Belgae, the Celtae or Galli proper, and the Aquitani; the three races remotely connected with each other. — The notion prevalent among continental scholars that Gallus is the same word as Gael, rests on unsound philology, and has thrown the ethnology of Europe into confusion. — The Cimbri invaded the Roman provinces 113 B.C.; came from the coasts of the Western Ocean; Greek speculation almost without exception connects them with the Kimmerioi; objections to this theory considered. — The Kimmerioi worked their way up the Dnieper to the Ukraine; thence north of the Hercynian range to the Elbe, and so to the Western Ocean. — This migration a gradual one, and *prior* to the irruption into Asia Minor recorded by Herodotus. — To this migration is chiefly due the Celtic settlements of Western Europe.

The notices handed down to us relative to the early colonization of Britain are surrounded with circumstances open to suspicion, and cannot serve in themselves as a foundation for history. It is only by looking at them from different points of view, and observing the relations they bear to results obtained from independent sources, that we can hope to give them any historical value. Our present inquiry is really part of a much larger one, and before we can enter upon it with any prospect of success we must consider the question, Who were the first settlers in the West of Europe?

The tribes commonly known as the Celtic are generally considered to be the earliest of the immigrant races. Modern speculation has suggested that they may have been preceded by one or other of the two races commonly known as the Basques and Fins. In the second chapter we shall discuss with some particularity the early history of the Basques; as regards the Fins, the only ground I am aware of for supposing that they were ever settled on the Western Ocean, is the peculiar shape of the skulls found in certain ancient deposits that occur north of the Eyder. These skulls are said to resemble those of the modern Lapps, a people well known to be of Finnish origin. But

it may be doubted if Craniology be entitled to all the credit it lays claim to. It brings into connexion races of most diverse origin, and actually puts Greek and Jew in the same category. Even were it granted that particular types of skull are characteristic of particular races, we should hardly be justified in drawing historical inferences from the few unsatisfactory specimens of this early people that have hitherto been brought to light. If future explorations confirm the conjecture that has been hazarded, we may perhaps conclude that the Finnish tribes now settled on the Baltic and the North Sea once reached as far south as Denmark. We cannot found any more general conclusion on such slender premisses.

The reader may have partly gathered that I incline to the old opinion, that the Celts were the earliest colonists of Western Europe. But under this name of Celts were included races of different character, who came westward by different routes and at dates widely separated from each other. The endeavour to trace the course of these several immigrations will be the main object of the present volume.

The small success that has hitherto attended investigations made on this subject is, I think, in great measure owing to the frequent misconstructions that have been put on the language of our classical authorities. We are apt to suppose that proper names have always had the same meaning attached to them, and that the same races have always been designated respectively as Iberes, Galli, Britanni, Germani, &c. But a little criticism will show us that these terms are used sometimes as proper names, sometimes as mere appellatives; sometimes with an ethnological, sometimes with a political signification, and we not unfrequently find even the same author employing them in different senses, accordingly as he is quoting from older writers, or adopts the current language of his day. Greek writers of the Augustan age are singularly prone to use language which is open to this charge of inconsistency.

Another ground of failure is, I think, owing to the 'philosophical' mode of treating history, which has of late become fashionable. We deal too much with abstract principles, and think too lightly of careful induction and the old-fashioned scholarship. We scrutinize the mysteries of the 'myth' and the legend, till we think more of the tools we have to work with than of the work we have to do with them. We generalize till history evaporates in the process, and leaves us a mere *caput mortuum* of worthless speculation.

I fear we cannot altogether dispense with the use of the word *myth*, or at least of some equivalent for it, though the term is now so vaguely used in popular language as hardly to convey to the reader's mind any definite meaning. Mr. Grote, anxious to make the word his own, gave it what he considered to be a more suitable orthography, and called it a *mythe*. It is well that if used at all the word should carry with it a meaning free from the vulgar associations that have gathered round it, and I shall therefore give it its Latin dress, and hope that in dealing with the *mythus* I shall not shift its meaning, and be guilty of the loose inaccurate reasoning I am deprecating in others.

A mythus I consider to be a fable which symbolizes historical, or what are supposed to be historical, facts; a tradition to be a tale of unknown origin, which purports to be historical, and has obtained a certain amount of credit; and if the tale has come down to us in a written form, I shall call it a legend. A mythus is the natural result of figurative language, and can hardly be avoided whenever prosopopoeia is tolerated. We meet with it where we might least expect it. In Domesday Book farms given to the monks of Westminster are said to be given to St. Peter. Here we have a mythus precisely similar to that we meet with in Grecian history, when we are told that Herakles conquered Spain and Gaul. In the earlier mythus the national God symbolizes the conquering people, in the later entry the saint represents the society that

adopted him as their patron. In modern history the mythus plays a very subordinate part, but a most important one in the early history of Greece. The value of the legend depends on circumstances; it may be a real or a distorted representation of actual facts, or it may be a mere figment; but a mythus is always worthy of careful consideration, and, when rightly interpreted, as a general rule it becomes history.

The course I shall endeavour to follow in the present inquiry is in every case to state first my authority, whatever it may be,—evidence of monuments, historic statements, mythus or legend—and then to give the inferences I draw from it. It will be my object carefully to distinguish between the groundwork and the superstructure, and to let the reader clearly see where authority ends and speculation begins. Simple as the rule may seem, every one that has tried to follow it knows the difficulties that attend its application; and seldom indeed among our modern scholars do we find it honestly carried out. As a general rule I shall give a proper name its Greek or its Latin dress, accordingly as I am quoting from a Greek or a Latin author. The mere English reader will quickly recognize the Latin Celtae in the Greek Keltoi; and it is well that the educated reader should have his attention kept constantly awake to the nature of the authority he has to trust to. There are indeed cases in which a slavish adherence to this rule might lead to inconvenience. Some modern writers, particularly foreigners, affect to call the Greeks *Hellenes.* It has the look of learning, but the show merely, not the substance. Homer called his countrymen Akhaioi and Danaoi, using in a general sense names which no doubt once had a restricted meaning. In like manner the later classical writers used the term Hellenes; but, if we follow them in this particular, we shall confound distinctions which are a valuable guide in tracing the intricacies of history, and bewilder the unlearned reader by introducing unnecessarily a novel phraseology.

In discussing events so remote in date as those we have to deal with, the widest research and the most careful induction will in many cases lead only to a weak probability. But several weak probabilities, if they all point in the same direction, may support a strong inference. It is only in sciences that have been brought within reach of numerical calculation that we can reason from premisses to a result with certainty; our ordinary convictions are the effect produced on the mind by concurrent probabilities, and on the strength of these convictions we do not hesitate to act in matters of the gravest import. A mythical or a legendary tale may throw light on the statement of some obscure writer, and give it an importance superior to that which belongs to more direct and weightier testimony if unsupported by such collateral evidence.

Happily the origin of the early Celts is illustrated by a purer light than can be furnished by legend or mythus. According to the Jewish records, Gomer, the reputed patriarch of this people, had three sons, Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah (Gen. 10. 3). Of these names we find no further mention in Scripture till after the lapse of eight or nine centuries, when Jeremiah takes up his prophecy against Babylon (51. 27): 'Call together against her the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz; appoint a captain against her; cause the horses to come up as the rough caterpillers.' A few years later Ezekiel, in his denunciations against Tyre (27. 14), passes in review the glories of the doomed city, and tells her, 'They of the house of *Togarmah* traded in thy fairs with horses and horsemen and mules;' and when recounting the forces of 'Gog, the land of Magog[1], the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal,' the

[1] The term Magog means properly the land of Gog, and it appears to be used in the earlier Scriptures (Gen. 10. 2) to personify all the wandering tribes connected with Gog. The name of the patriarch when used by itself may denote the dominant tribe. In the time of Herodotus (4. 20) such dominant tribes seems to have been called the Royal Skuthai; and it was probably this branch of the Skuthai that invaded Asia. At a later period, when the distinction between the Royal and the other Skuthai had become

same prophet includes in the number, 'Gomer and all his bands, the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands.' The word here rendered 'bands' is used by Ezekiel alone, and by him only for three purposes; to denote the bands of Gomer and Togarmah, as in the passages quoted, the bands of Gog (38, 39), and the bands Zedekiah gathered round him to help him against the king of Babylon (12. and 17). It is not an unfair inference that the word was used specially to denote those bands which we know from other sources were at this time spreading terror throughout Asia; and we may reasonably conclude that, while the descendants of Ashkenaz had become a settled people, the races known to the Jews by the names of Gomer and Togarmah were wandering tribes, breeders of horses and mules, who moved from place to place as want of pasturage, the demands of traffic, or the hope of booty, led them.

With the first dawn of Greek literature we find notices of a people called the Kimmerioi, and there are grounds for the belief that the early Greeks employed this term as a general name for the Celtic races. The substitution of a *k* for an initial *g* is common in Hebrew, and not unfrequent in Greek; the Hebrew *gamal*, a camel, takes the form of *kamēlos* in that language, and *Cabalia*, a name given by the Greeks to a mountainous tract in Lycia, inhabited by a Shemitic people, no doubt originated in the Hebrew word *gebal*, a mountain. We can therefore understand how a portion of the Celtic race may have given to their national name of Gomer a pronunciation which would justify the Greeks in rendering it by the name Kimmerioi. The tribe to which the name of Gomer is specially applied in Scripture appears to have been a migratory horde, after certain of the related tribes had settled down in their

familiar to the Jews, they seem to have used the phrase Gog and Magog to denote the whole Scythian race; just as we are told the Arabs call the people of China *Chin* and *Machin*, that is, the Chinese proper and the connected races.

respective districts. It can hardly be doubted that this migratory people at some time or other came into contact with the Greeks, and from them the Greeks may have derived the name Kimmerioi.

When the author of the Odyssey (11. 13) carried Odusseus

> 'To the furthest limit of the deeply flowing Ocean,
> Where are the people and city of the Kimmerioi
> Hidden in darkness and cloud—'

he must, I think, have had some obscure knowledge, derived probably from sources we shall investigate hereafter, of certain Kimmerian settlements on the Western Ocean. The locality intended can hardly be mistaken. On his onward voyage Odusseus visited the country of the Lotophagoi, who, all are agreed, lived near the Syrtes, and on his return came to the 'island Thrinakia' which is as generally acknowledged to be Sicily. The Ocean was in the opinion of the early Greeks a river circling round the earth and forming its outer boundary. All the conditions these circumstances impose are met by the hypothesis suggested, and I know of no other that can satisfy them. The persuasion which prevailed among the ancients on this subject is shown by the fact that the Turdetanoi who lived near Cadiz affected to show the relics Odusseus left behind him when he visited their country (Strabo 3.4.3. p. 157). If we confine our attention to the Homeric poems there seems to be only one conclusion open to us, viz. that the early Greeks gave to certain tribes of Western Europe the name of Kimmerioi.

But when we look more deeply into the question we meet with difficulties. The visit of Odusseus to the realms of the Dead, and his Nekuia or incantation, strongly impressed the imagination of the Greeks, and are often referred to in their later literature. There are several places in Europe supposed to be more or less connected with the spirits of the dead, and in their neighbourhood we often meet with the same names as occur in the Homeric

Hades, e.g. Styx, Acheron, Cocytus, Pyriphlegethon, the Kimmerioi, &c. At Buchaetium in Epirus was 'an oracle of the Dead' (Herod. 5. 92. 7), and near it was a river named Acheron which had a Cocytus (Paus. 1. 17. 5) for its tributary, and flowing through an Akherusian lake emptied itself into the sea at the promontory called Kheimerion (Strabo 7. 7. 8; Thuc. 1. 46). Again, at the Italian lake Avernus there was another such oracle, and in its neighbourhood was an Akherusian lake, the waters of the Styx, and the hot waters of the Pyriphlegethon; and the Kimmerioi according to Ephorus dwelt there. Modern criticism would explain the recurrence of these names by supposing that the early Greeks fixed their Hades at the furthest limit of their geographical knowledge, viz. in Epirus, and then as their knowledge increased removed it with the familiar names and associations further westward. But this hypothesis does not meet the circumstances of the case. The earliest notice of Hades, viz. that which occurs in the Odyssey, fixes it at the extreme west of Europe, while the familiar names are met with in the very heart of Greece, and were apparently imposed at a later period. At Hermione in the Peloponnesus was a temple dedicated to Dēmētēr, and in its neighbourhood a chasm supposed to communicate with Hades, and an Akherusian lake (Paus. 2. 35. 4–10). Styx may have been originally the proper name of the Arcadian waterfall which Homer refers to (Il. 8. 369) and which in all probability he had seen, but whether the river Acheron was at first a Greek reality, or the mere creature of Greek fancy or a fiction of Greek adoption, are questions that admit of much difference of opinion.

It is, I think, on the whole a preferable hypothesis to suppose that the names—whether those of actual localities or not—were such as had gathered round them associations suitable for the purpose for which they were employed in the early Greek poems, and that the golden thread on which they were strung together was merely the poet's

fancy. The familiar imagery of the Nekuia would of course lead the popular mind to look for an Acheron, &c., in every spot which the Spirits of the Dead were supposed to haunt, and to this circumstance I would attribute most of the names which occur at Buchaetium, the Avernus, &c. With these considerations is mixed up a question of great importance in our present inquiry, one indeed to which the preceding observations were intended to be introductory—I mean the question whether the term Kimmerioi as connected with Buchaetium, the Avernus, &c., is to be looked upon merely as a specimen of Homeric phraseology, or as having historical significance and indicating the presence at some period or other of the people who bore that name.

The question is not without its difficulty; but my respect for Homer's geography has increased the more I have studied it; and the mere fact of his locating Kimmerioi on the Western Ocean would of itself incline me to believe that a people bearing the name were really settled there. Hecataeus, who flourished in the fifth century B.C. and who had in all probability visited Spain, speaks of a town named 'Kimmeris,' and the testimony of the great geographer is not to be lightly set aside, notwithstanding the scepticism of Strabo (7. 3. 6). Again, the statement of Ephorus (Strabo 5. 4. 5) that the men of the Avernus were called Kimmerioi, must have weight with every real critic when he remembers the high character this geographer bore, and that he was a native of Cumae in the immediate neighbourhood.

The course of these inquiries brings us face to face with the vexed questions relative to the early populations of Central Italy. Since Niebuhr's time these questions have been discussed by two of our own countrymen—by Mr. E. H. Bunbury with judgment, and with his usual acuteness by the late Sir G. C. Lewis. I must however confess that the results arrived at are not, to my mind, altogether satisfactory, and I venture to think that by placing the subject in a somewhat different point of view, we may

show its outlines more distinctly, and thus be able to draw more trustworthy inferences.

The Italian people of whom we have the earliest notice were the Siculi, or as the Greeks called them the Sikeloi. When Odusseus returned a broken man to his native Ithaca, the insolent suitors proposed that he should be shipped off to the Sikeloi, who would give a good price for him (Od. 20. 383). These Sikeloi could not be the inhabitants of Sicily, for in the Odyssey that island is called Sikania, whence we may infer that at the time the poem was written Sicily was peopled not by the Sikeloi but by the Sikanoi. Strabo (1. 1. 10. p. 6) represents Homer as acquainted with the extremity of Italy because he mentions the Sikeloi; and the people Strabo had in view were no doubt the same people that were driven from the south of Italy by the Oinotrioi, and whom Antiochus (Strabo 6. 1. 6) called the Sikeloi. The Sikeloi mentioned in the Odyssey must have lived on the Italian coast opposite Ithaca, and have been 'the Sikeloi' whom the Locrians had to deal with when they founded their colony in Bruttium (Polyb. 12. 5). This ancient people were not however confined to the south of Italy. We have good authority for saying that they once reached northwards even as far as the neighbourhood of Rome. In a well-known passage (lib. 1. 9) Dionysius informs us that at one time the neighbourhood of Rome was peopled by the Sikeloi, and that whether any other race had dwelt there previously or it had lain waste no one could tell. Tibur, Ficulea, Antemnae, Tellenae, Falerii, Fescennium, and other places are mentioned as towns of this ancient people (16, 20 and 21). We are told (Dion. 1. 9) that the 'Aborigines' who dwelt in the mountains or unwalled villages after a long warfare expelled the Sikeloi, and assisted by 'the Pelasgoi and certain other Greeks' built walled towns and subjugated the whole district between the Tiber and the Liris. The Sikeloi (Dion. 1. 22) retreated into Sicily, which was then inhabited by the Sikanoi, an Iberic people,

who not long before had fled into the island from the Ligues and given it the name of Sikania. Some writers fixed the migration of the Sikeloi before the Trojan War (Dion. I. 22); but Thucydides (6. 2) places it about 300 years before the Greeks began to colonize Sicily, that is, eight or nine centuries B.C., which is consistent with the fact that Sicily is called Sikania in the Odyssey. Many years must have elapsed before the great body of the Sikeloi had transferred themselves to the island, and numbers of them were no doubt left behind in the Peninsula (Ib.). A portion of this people, there is reason to believe, long maintained themselves amid the woods and precipices which surrounded the lake Avernus.

The Avernus lies in the crater of an extinct volcano, and in ancient times was surrounded by gloomy woods, which were felled by order of Agrippa. In its neighbourhood was Cumae, the earliest of the Greek colonies in Italy; and from the inhabitants of this town Strabo must have obtained, mediately or immediately, the information respecting the Avernus which he has handed down to us (5. 4. 5): 'Preceding writers have connected their story of the Aornos (Avernus) with the Homeric Nekuia[1], and they tell us, that here was the Oracle of the Dead and that Odusseus came to it, &c. Aornos is shut in by steep sides rising high at every point except the entrance. They are indeed now brought into cultivation, but formerly were thickly covered with wild forests filled with high trees and impassable, which made the bay full of shade and well suited for superstitious purposes. The people of the country fabled that birds as they were flying over fell into the water, killed by the vapours rising from it, as happens in Plutonic localities; and they supposed this place to be a certain Plutonium and that the Kimmerioi lived here; and they sailed in after first sacrificing, and appeasing the subterranean deities, there being priests who instructed them in these matters, and who had taken the place on hire. There is close to the

[1] Vide p. 8.

sea a certain fountain of fresh water from which they all abstain, considering it to be the water of the Styx; and somewhere in that place is an Oracle, and they judged Pyriphlegethon to be there from the hot water in the neighbourhood of Akherousia.

'But Ephorus assigns the place to the Kimmerioi, and says they lived in under-ground dwellings which they called *argillai*, and through certain excavated passages passed about to each other and conveyed strangers to the Oracle, which was constructed deep in the ground; and that they lived by mining and by those who inquired of the Oracle, and by certain imposts appointed by the king; and that a custom prevailed in that place among those who were engaged about the Oracle, never to see the sun but to go forth at night from the chasms of the rocks, &c., and that the men at last were destroyed by a certain king with whom events did not turn out according to the Oracle, but that the Oracle still continued, having been removed to another place. Such are the fables told us by those who have gone before, but now that the wood around the Aornos has been felled by Agrippa, and the country built upon,' &c.

In Latin poetry Avernus signifies Hell; Pluto was the Regnator Averni, Charon the Sulcator Averni, and Proserpine the Juno Averna or infernal Juno. Lucretius in a well-known passage (6. 740) tells us that the 'loca Averna' were so called because birds that attempted to fly over them were suffocated by the sulphureous vapour. He evidently supposed, like the authors whom Strabo copied, that the Latin name Avernus and the Greek name Aornos were connected with the Greek adjective *aornos*, birdless. But were this etymology a true one, the adjective *aornos* must at one time have contained a digamma—*a Fornos*; and we have no reason to believe it ever did contain this letter. The Greek *orn-is*, one of the elements of the adjective *a-orn-os*, is used to denote a bird of prey, and is probably connected with the Anglo-Saxon *earn*, an eagle. Words

answering to *earn* are found in all the Teutonic dialects, but nowhere can I find any traces of an initial *w*[1]. The Greek derivation seems to fail us; let us see if the Celtic dialects can throw any light upon the subject.

The Welsh *Uffern*, Breton *Ivern*, Irish *Ifearn* and *Ifrionn* signify hell; and the identity of these words with the Latin Avernus will hardly be questioned. It is very unlikely that a word like Avernus, which was only used in Latin poetry, should have crept from the Latin into these Celtic dialects; but if we suppose the Celts were at one time settled round the lake, and that struck with its gloomy and weird aspect they gave it the name of Uffern, every difficulty vanishes. Uffern would take the form of Avernus in Latin, and of Aornos in Greek, the digamma being dropped according to a common Greek custom. This hypothesis affords us also an explanation of the word *argillai*. The Welsh *argel* signifies a retreat, and the Irish *arcuil* a hermit's cell. This word seems to have designated the low huts, some of them still extant, in which the Irish monks used to live. The church of Arrigal in Derry was formerly called Aireacul Adhamnan, the cell of Adamnan[2]. The name is common both in Irish and in Welsh topography. Dr. Reeves cites the examples Errigal Keerogue in the diocese of Armagh, Errigal Trough in that of Clogher, and Aireacul Muadhain; and in Shropshire we have Childs Ercal, High Ercal and Ercal-wood on the Wrekin. The occurrence of the three names Kimmerioi, Aornos and Argillai, seems to me to show satisfactorily that the place must have been at one time inhabited by a Celtic people.

In following these speculations we should ever bear in mind that Ephorus was a native of Cumae, which lay in the immediate neighbourhood of the Avernus. He must have been intimately acquainted with the country round his native city, and with the whole of its then recent history.

[1] In the Icelandic *ar-i*, an eagle, we have another form of the word, but still we find no trace of the initial *w*.

[2] Vide Dr. Reeves' edition of Archbishop Colton's Visitation, p. 80.

He flourished about the close of the fifth century B.C., not very long after the conquest of Cumae by the Samnites; and the king who, as he tells us, slew the Kimmerioi of the Aornos and for a time put a stop to the utterances of the oracle, was no doubt a Samnite chief, and perhaps the one that captured Cumae. The style of the narrative and the details into which the historian enters shew that he was speaking of matters familiarly known to him; and I think there can be no reasonable doubt that, when he gave the men who ministered about the Oracle the name of Kimmerioi, he was employing language sanctioned by the ordinary usage of the country.

Here then we have three names—Kimmerioi, Aornos, Argillai—which can be explained satisfactorily on the hypothesis we have started, viz. that the inhabitants were Celts, and I believe on no other hypothesis. That these Celts were Siculi seems to be equally clear, for if not Siculi they must have been Osci. But the Osci, as is generally acknowledged, used a language akin to the Latin, and must have been originally not a Celtic but a Greek people.

Ptolemy (2. 17) locates a people called Sikoulōtoi 'above Liburnia'; and according to Pliny (3. 19), Siculi and Liburni once occupied large tracts on the east coast of Italy, from which they were expelled by the Umbri. He specially mentions the districts of Praetutii and Adria in Picenum as parts of the country so occupied by them. We may therefore reasonably conclude that Siculi came into Italy from the opposite coast of Greece. Other circumstances point to Greece as the mother-country of the Sikeloi. In the Odyssey (18. 84) mention is made of Ekhetos the cruel king of Epirus, and the Scholiast tells us he was the son of Bouketos, who gave his name to a town in Sicily and was king of the Sikeloi. The Scholium was evidently founded on a blundered legend, but we may gather thus much from it—that there was at least a legendary connexion between Epirus and the Sikeloi. In the neighbourhood of Buchaetium in Epirus were the Acherusian lake and the Khim-

merian[1] promontory, names which at once recall the topography of the Avernus; and there was also, as at the Avernus, an Oracle of the Dead (Herod. 5. 92. 7). Even supposing that the name Kimmerioi were introduced into Italy by the Greeks of Cumae, it would be very strange that the Scholiast, or the legendary he followed, should locate in Epirus the very people, the Sikeloi, whom criticism fixes upon as those most likely to have dwelt round the lake Avernus. If the Sikeloi passed from Greece into Italy we might expect to find the names Kimmerioi and Sikeloi in both countries.

Supposing that the Sikeloi migrated into Italy from Greece, we should naturally expect to find some traces of their language in the topography of the latter country. The 'rocky Calydon' (Il. 2. 640), the scene of the celebrated boar-hunt, was drained by the Evenus, and when we find the names Calydon and Evenus thus brought into connexion, we are at once reminded of the Welsh names Celyddon and Afon; and the inference we draw from this coincidence is strengthened, when we learn from Plutarch (De Fluv. 57) that the Achelous in the same neighbourhood was at first called the Axen-os, inasmuch as there was a river in Gaul called Axon-a, now the Aisne. On the eastern side of Greece, in the country of the Briges, who certainly were a Phrygian or Celtic people, we find the Axius carrying to the Egean the drainage of the Mons Barnus, and are at once reminded of the Celtic river-name, the Axe, and of the Cornish *bourn* or *burn* a hill—a name which plays an important part in ancient Celtic topography. Again, in Illyricum were the Albici Montes, whose name seems clearly to be Celtic, and also the fortress Dimalos. Dimalos has been considered (Niebuhr, Lect. 1. 302) to be an Albanian compound signifying twae-hill, in allusion to the peculiarities of the site. A similar etymology might have been furnished by certain Celtic dialects—*dau*, Welsh; *di*, Ir.;

[1] In Odyssey 11. 14 the Scholiast gives us Khimmeriōn as a varied form of Kimmeriōn, so that the aspirated initial need not occasion us any difficulty.

two, and *maol*, Ir.; *moel*, Welsh, a hill. The fact is, *all* the Indo-European dialects with the exception of the Teutonic have their second numeral answering to the first element *di*, and others besides the Celtic and Albanian have the second element *mal* or *mul* a hill, so that various historical hypotheses might be supported on the etymology of Dimalos, if it were really such as Niebuhr supposes it to be.

We have hitherto used the term Kimmerioi to denote a people who seem to have settled at a very remote period in the countries lying along the Mediterranean. The name is more familiarly known as designating a people whom Herodotus locates in the Crimea, and in the steppes stretching from the Dnieper to the Don. He tells us (4. 11) that this people were invaded by the Skuthai, and weakened by intestine feuds fled before the invaders, and passed over into Asia. He tells us also, that they fled by way of the sea, but that the pursuing Skuthai missed their way, and leaving Caucasus to the right entered Media, as it would seem, by the Caspian gates. The terror inspired by the fugitive Kimmerioi, their uncouth appearance, and the lines of waggons that accompanied their march, were long remembered by the Greeks, whose colonies even then dotted the shores of Asia Minor; while the tyranny which the Skuthai exercised for nearly thirty years over the whole of Asia, from Media westward, is not only one of the most remarkable, but also one of the best authenticated facts connected with the history of this early period. Our most trustworthy authorities agree in fixing these events in the latter part of the sixth century B.C.—in other words, about twenty or thirty years before Ezekiel prophesied; and I do not see how any critical and unprejudiced mind can fail to recognize in the Kimmerioi and the Skuthai of Herodotus the Gomer and the Magog which at this period again make their appearance in the Jewish Scriptures.

Niebuhr impugns the testimony of Herodotus, and mainly on the ground that the mountains of Caucasus dip steeply

into the Euxine, and leave no room for the road by which the Greek historian would lead the Kimmerioi into Asia. The German critic would conduct them along the *western* coast, and so over the Bosphorus. We may observe, that it is not only when relating the invasion of the Kimmerioi that Herodotus alludes to the road in question. He evidently had it in mind when he spoke (1. 104) of the journey from Scythia to Media; and again when he refers to the plan for invading Media proposed by the Scythians to the Spartans (6. 84). The proposal was, that the Scythians should invade Media by way of the Phasis[1], while the Spartans advanced from Ephesus against Persia. It is clear Herodotus believed there was a well-known and accustomed road leading from the north to the south of Caucasus, along the eastern side of the Euxine, and if we turn to the modern maps of the district, we find a road marked as running in this direction. It is true the road has fallen into disuse, but the reason is an obvious one. The valleys opening upon it from the mountains have been for centuries peopled by warlike and independent tribes, who would soon have made a prey of any traveller that ventured upon it. Russia has lately laid a heavy hand on these mountaineers, and by expatriating or exterminating has at length subdued them. Let us hope she has at least given free passage to the wayfarer.

When we remember how remote was the date of these events, and how far removed they were from the general range of Greek inquiry, we need hardly be surprised when we find Strabo (1. 20) inferring a knowledge of the Kimmerioi on the part of Homer, because '*about his time or a little before him* they had overrun the whole country as far as Ionia.' These chronological blunders seem to have been prevalent among his contemporaries. He tells us (1. 2. 9) that Homer 'though he knew the Kimmerioi inhabited the Kimmerian Bosporus, a gloomy region

[1] Omar Pasha took this route when he endeavoured to penetrate into Georgia in the year 1855.

in the north, transferred them, consistently enough, to a certain dark locality in the district of Hades, as it suited well the fables about "The wandering" (i.e. of Odusseus). That he was well acquainted with them (i.e. the Kimmerioi) the *chroniclers show us who record the inroad of the Kimmerioi either a little before or about his time*.'

Strabo, like so many of our modern critics, reasoned from the circumstances of his own time and position. *He* had only heard of the Kimmerioi as dwellers in the Crimea and invaders of Asia Minor, and he supposes Homer to have looked on the world from the same point of view, forgetting the changes that nine or ten centuries must necessarily have brought with them. The chronology of the chroniclers—if indeed they committed themselves to any definite statement on the subject—is not entitled to much weight, for they had not in the present case the means of computation which in some other cases were certainly within their reach.

We should not, however, omit to state that, under a date answering to 1078 B.C., the Chronicon of Eusebius mentions an invasion of Asia Minor by the Kimmerioi *and the Amazons*; and that Orosius (I. 21) refers to such invasion as taking place thirty years before the foundation of Rome. Now the Amazons are generally supposed to symbolize a Slavish people, and they may have been introduced as a party to the invasion with reference to the story in the Iliad (3. 186) which represents Priam as advancing to the Sangarius to assist the Phrygians Otreus and Mugdōn, in their struggle with the Amazons. That Slavish races ravaged Asia Minor at this early period is probable enough, but that the Kimmerioi of the Crimea were their allies is hardly credible. If the latter people accompanied the Amazons, they must have left traces behind them in the Homeric poems. Herodotus (I. 6) evidently considered the invasion of Asia Minor by the Kimmerioi in the sixth century B.C. as the *first* inroad of that people.

In threading our way through the intricacies of early

Celtic history, I have endeavoured to illustrate the statement of Scripture by the aid of such light as is afforded by our classical authorities. A similar attempt was made nearly 2000 years ago by a Jew, who had facilities for arriving at just conclusions on these subjects which are no longer within reach. Josephus was not only versed in the learning of his own country, but was also acquainted with Greek literature, and, notwithstanding his imperfect criticism, his opinions deserve our attentive study. He tells us (Ant. I. 6) that the seven sons of Japheth dwelt beyond the ranges of Mount Taurus and Amanus, and that their descendants advanced into Asia as far as the Tanais (Don), and into Europe as far as Gadeira (Cadiz); that being the first settlers of these districts they called them after their own name; 'for Gomaros founded the people that are called by the Greeks Galatai, but who were called Gomareis; and Magōgēs settled the people who were named after him Magōgai, but by themselves are called Skuthai[1].' He moreover tells us that of Gomer's three sons 'Askhanaxos founded the Askhanaxoi, who are called by the Greeks Rhēgines; Rhiphathēs, the Rhiphathaioi, who are called Paphlagones; Thrugammes the Thrugammaoi, who by the Greeks are called Phruges.' The Thrugammēs of Josephus was intended to represent the 'Thorgamos' of the Septuagint and the Togarmah of Scripture, the transposition of the *r* being a well-known Shemitic letter change. There is reason to believe that the Thrugammaoi were the same people as the Trocmi, one of the three confederated races which together made up the Galatai of Asia. We shall have our attention more particularly called to this people when we come to investigate the history of the Belgae.

Josephus considered Riphath to represent the Paphlagones, and his views on this subject are confirmed by certain indications which we meet with in classical geography.

[1] Josephus is clearly in error when he says that Skuthai was the *native* name of the people who bore it. See below, p. 85.

In a note to Dion. Perieg. (792) Eustathius tells us, 'it is said the Bithunoi once possessed the country from the Bosporus as far as the Rhēbas, but that the hilly country beyond on the Pontos the Thunoi possessed, as far as the river Kalēs; so that the Thunoi and Bithunoi were conterminous, and were so called from certain famous brothers, Thunos and Bithunos, sons of Phineus by adoption, as Arrian says, &c.; and he (Arrian) calls the land about the river Psillius Rhēbantia.'

As Arrian was a native of the district, these extracts deserve careful consideration. The neighbourhood of the Rhēbas is connected with some of the earliest Greek legends. It is said to have been visited by the Argonauts (Apoll. Rhod. 2. 652), and is described by Dionysius Perieg. (790) as the rich district:—

> 'Where the Rhēbas sends forth a lovely stream;
> The Rhēbas which proceeds to the mouth of the Pontos;
> The Rhēbas which pours down the sweetest water upon earth.'

Rhebantia is, of course, a derivative of Rhēbas (genit. Rhebantis); and as the course of the Psillius lay considerably to the eastward of that river, it would seem the Rhēbas gave its name to a large tract of country lying on the coast east of the Bosphorus. So frequent in language is the interchange between *nt* and *th*, that we need not hesitate in considering Rhebantia as the Greek equivalent for Riphath. On the southern coast of the Euxine ran a long line of country called Paphlagonia, consisting mainly of mountain-forest, and stretching from the rich district of Bithynia on the west to the equally rich district on the east, once inhabited by the Henetoi. In the time of Moses the western district or Riphath proper seems to have been the ruling power, and to have given its name to the adjoining countries, but in the time of Homer, the pre-eminence had passed to the Henetoi, for Pulaimenēs who led the Paphlagones to Troy, was 'of the Henetoi' (Il. 2. 851). The intrusion of the Bithunoi into Riphath dates after the

Trojan war, and therefore was not the reason why Rhebantia lost its pre-eminence. According to the Greek legend (Apoll. Rhod. 2. 129), the haughty Bebrukes 'who dwelt in that district warred unsuccessfully with the Argonauts and with certain of their neighbours' (Ib. 2. 140). Eratosthenes (Plut. 5. 33) represented them as a people that had disappeared from Asia; and they were probably displaced by the intrusive races, Lukoi, Trōes, Kilikes, &c., who successively gained a footing in the Troad and its neighbourhood.

As this name of Bebrukes long survived in Western Europe, we may be excused for speculating a little on its origin and affinities. Stephanus Byzantinus tells us that 'Berekuntos' was the genitive of an obsolete nominative, the name of a certain Phrygian town; and according to analogy, this name must have been Berekus. We learn from Strabo (12. 8. 21) that Aeschylus in the Niobe spoke of

> 'The land of Berekus, where is the dwelling of Adrasteia,'

and connected it with Mount Ida. Strabo at the same time describes the Berekuntes as a people that had perished; and elsewhere (10. 3. 12) he represents them as having been worshippers of Rhea, whom they called 'Mother of the Gods,' 'the great Goddess'; and from the places where she was worshipped, the Idaean, the Dindumene, the Sipulene, the Pessinuntian. They also gave her the name of Kubele (Cybele). Servius, in his comment on 'the Berecynthian Mother' (Aen. 6. 785), fixes Berecynthus on the Sangarius. As we find these two ancient races, the Bebrukes and the Berekuntes, thus located in nearly the same districts, we can hardly help suspecting that they were the same people. Perhaps Berek-us may be a derivation of the root Berek, and Bebruk-es a duplicate of Berek, formed after the model of Leleg-es, Dodon-a, &c.

The Hebrew name Ashkenaz is generally supposed to be connected with the Greek names Askanios and Askanīa. The disappearance of the final *z* creates a difficulty; but

the fact is the Shemitic sibilants *do* sometimes melt away in a strange and unexpected way (Ewald, Heb. Gr. § 31), and possibly the Greek and Hebrew words may be connected. Homer brings Phrygians to the aid of Troy from Ascania:—

> 'The Phruges Phorkus led, and Askanios the godlike
> From afar from Askania.'—Il. 2. 862.

Strabo (12. 4. 5, p. 564) tells us that the Ascanian lake, afterwards called the lake of Nicaea, lay partly in Mysia and partly in Phrygia, and he considers the district round this lake to be the one referred to by Homer. The district was certainly called Ascania, and the river that drained it into the Propontis the Ascanian river (Steph. Byz.); but still I cannot consider it to be the district Homer refers to. The Phruges came to Troy 'from afar,' a phrase that is hardly applicable to a place that lay so near the Troad as the lake of Nicaea. There was another Ascanian lake[1] near the sources of the Maeander, on the southern border of Phrygia, which produced salt naturally, and made the neighbourhood independent of the sea as regarded the production of that commodity (Arrian 1. 29). Hamilton (1. 502) identifies it with the lake Chardak, which still provides salt for a wide extent of country, and I suspect it was from this distant salt lake that Phorkus and Askanios brought their Phrygians to Troy. But neither of these Ascanian districts lying on the western frontier of Phrygia could well be the district to which the name Ashkenaz was applied in Scripture. Ashkenaz was not only inhabited by the descendants of Gomer (Gen. 10. 3), but as late as the sixth century B.C. was a well-known district, the cavalry of which bore an important part in the war that led to the destruction of Babylon (Jer. 51. 27). Josephus

[1] All the Ascanian districts contain lakes. May not the name Ascanian be connected with the Celtic word *esc*, or Axs, which can be traced all over Europe from Greece to Britain? By adopting a common plural-ending we might get *Esc-en*, the waters, which gives us an appropriate meaning.

evidently supposed the name Askhanaxoi to be familiar to his readers, and says the Greeks called the inhabitants Rhegines. This name I have never met with in Greek literature, but I have little doubt that Josephus used it to signify the inhabitants of the north of Media. When speaking of the great lakes of Armenia, Strabo (11. 14. 8, p. 529) mentions one named 'Arsēnē, which they also call Thonitis. It is full of nitron, cleansing and purifying clothes as by a process of fulling, and consequently it cannot be drunk. The Tigris is carried through it, rushing from the mountain district about Niphates, and keeps its stream unmixed by reason of its swiftness, from whence too came the name, the Medes calling an arrow *tigris*.' The district lying along the course of the upper Tigris seems to have been known, especially among the Arabs and the Syrians, as Arzen, but to have been known to the Armenians by the name of Aghdsen (S. Martin, p. 156). It was called Arzanena by Amm. Marcell. (25. 7) and its inhabitants, Arzamenoi (evidently a mistake for Arzanenoi) by Procopius (De Bell. Pers. 1. 8), though in his work, De Aedif. (3. 2), he calls the district Arxanē. The name seems to have varied with the dialect of the various races in the neighbourhood,—Arzen, Aghdsen, Arxanē. In his campaign against Minni, Sardanapalus boasted of having wasted the district of Arsyani. It is difficult to fix with precision the localities mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions, but possibly we may have here the district we are speaking of.

Though we conclude that the district at the sources of the Tigris gave a name to this branch of the Celtic people, it does not necessarily follow that they were confined within its limits. It is not improbable that the Askhanaxoi, as Josephus calls them, were spread as far north as the Euxine. The classical writers tell us the Euxine was first called Pontos Axenos, or inhospitable sea, and that the name was changed to Euxenos, or hospitable, for the sake of the omen. But Axenos may be a foreign name in a

Greek dress, and the sea may have been originally called the Axen Sea from the Ascanian tribes that dwelt on its coasts. On this hypothesis the Ligures, or Ligues, settled on the Euxine[1], must have been Ascanians; and we may perhaps thus account for the name of Askenazim, which the modern Jews give to that branch of their race which is settled in Poland and the adjoining districts, for classical writers certainly locate Ligurian races in the west of their Germania.

Homer's knowledge of the Phrygians and the cognate races was probably confined to such tribes as dwelt on the southern coast of the Euxine and the frontiers of Lydia. He alludes, as we have seen, to the Henetoi and the Paphlagones on the Euxine, and he brings Phruges to Troy from far Askania, under the conduct of Phorkus and Askanios. There cannot, I think, be much doubt that the district last mentioned was the southern portion of Phrygia adjacent to Pisidia, and moreover, that Askanios was a mere appellative, and meant the Askanian. In like manner the Otreus and Mugdōn, whom Priam aided in their wars with the Amazons, must have signified the Otryan and the Mygdonian; for Strabo (12. 4. 7, p. 566) mentions a village named Otroia as lying north of the lake of Nicaea, and the Mygdones are generally located a little further northward. What was the origin of the name Phruges, which seems to have included all these local appellatives, is a question of difficulty; but important issues depend upon it, and difficult though the question be, we should not pass it by without at least making an attempt to explain it.

Hesychius has the entry 'Briges—according to some the Phruges; according to others barbarians; according to others men of barbarous speech.' Juba informs us that by the Ludoi a freeman is called Brix (Brig-s).

We know from Herodotus (7. 73) that the Phruges, or Phrygians, were called Briges in Macedonia; and we may gather that, according to Juba, Briges or Phruges in the

[1] Vide Chap. III.

Lydian language signified freemen. It is however a question what language Juba meant by the term Lydian. His contemporary Strabo tells us (13. 4, p. 631) that Lydian was one of the four languages spoken at Ciburis in Cabalis, but that hardly a trace of the language was to be found in his day in Lydia proper; and it is a fact that the greater number of the words handed down to us as Lydian are really Celtic. The Maiones, or proper Lydians, were neighboured on all sides by Celtic tribes, and as their empire expanded they appear to have lost their language amid the teeming multitudes of the subject races. When Juba said that the Ludoi called a freeman Brig-s, he doubtless meant that the phrase was current in the district which once formed the Lydian empire. Brigs, there can be little doubt, was a Phrygian or Celtic word. It may, I think, be traced even in modern times, both in the Celtic and in the Teutonic languages; for I do not hesitate to consider it to be merely a variant form of our own word Frack or Frank.

The Franks were called in Anglo-Saxon Franc-an, and in Icelandic Frakkar. The letter change, which connects Frakk-ar with Frank-un, is well known in the Teutonic dialects. In the Icelandic Frack-r is a Frank, and Frack-i a brave fellow. This last word is known to our northern dialect,—

'Ther was never a *freake* our foot wold fle' (*Chevy Chace*),—

as also the adjective *frack*, quick, hasty. All these words may possibly be derived from the Icelandic frā-r, quick; and we may perhaps infer that the term Franks primarily signified, not so much men that were politically free, as brave fellows, dare-devils, men that feared no one and cared for no one.

Owen Pugh, in his Welsh Dictionary, gives us the following definition: 'Franc, pl. od. a prompt or active one; a freeman; a Frenchman. Different tribes of Celts went under the appellation of Franks. The people about the

river Seine were so called before the Franks of Germany settled in Gaul.' Owen Pugh gives us no authority for the latter part of his statement, but there really seems to be some grounds for it. Stephanus Byzantinus quotes Parthenius Phocaeus as his authority for saying that the Phraggoi were a tribe in Italy near the Alps; and Agathias (1. 2) represents 'the tribe of the Phraggoi as neighbours to and bordering on Italy, and as formerly called Germanoi.' Agathias was a man of books, and often used, as I believe he here uses, language drawn from ancient writers, though altogether inapplicable to the circumstances of his own times. The 'Phraggoi,' who dwelt near the Alps, were, I suspect, the people whom Caesar calls Veragri. Caesar locates them as it would seem north of the Valais (B. G. 3. 1), and Dio Cassius (39. 5) makes them reach from the lake of Geneva to the Alps. The term 'Phraggio' appears to have been merely another name for the Celtic Germanoi, i.e. for the marauding tribes who infested the northern portion of the Alpine district. The word Franc has several cognate words in Welsh, e.g. *fraeth*, prompt; *frain*, frankness, &c.; so there can be little doubt that it was not only a Teutonic, but also a genuine Celtic word.

If on the strength of the passage I have quoted from Hesychius, we consider Phruges to be a Phrygian name signifying *freemen*, we may, I think, be justified in drawing the inference that as the word Franks signified a people that defied the domination of Rome, so the Phruges were the Phrygian tribes that refused submission to the intrusive races that had established themselves on the coasts of Asia Minor. We can thus understand how Homer came to give the name of Phruges to the several races he alludes to under the personifications Askanios, Otreus, Mugdōn, &c. That there were frequent invasions of the coast-districts we know from notices that occur in the classical authors. We have seen that Apollonius Rhodius represents the Argonauts as fighting with the Bebrukes and their king Amukos;

and according to Apollodorus (2. 5. 9) Herakles aided Lukos in his wars with the Bebrukes, and having slain Mugdōn brother of Amukos gave the land of the Bebrukes to Lukos. The interpretation of this mythus seems to be easy enough. The Lukoi or Lycians with the aid of certain allies attacked the Bebrukes and Mugdones, and seized upon a portion of their territory. But the Mygdonians, though vanquished, still clung to their ancient seats, and in the Iliad they appear as the allies rather than the subjects of the intrusive races. We have clear evidence[1] that at the time of the Trojan war the Lycians were a powerful if not the predominant tribe in the Troad. Diodorus' (4. 7. 4. and following verses) blundered legend makes Tantalos a Paphlagonian and represents Ilus, son of Tros, the founder of Ilion, as the invader who expelled him from Paphlagonia. Pausanias too (2. 22) tells us that it was Ilus who drove Pelops from Sipylus, though, misled by another blundered legend, he makes him the son of Phryx. We know from Strabo (11. 7. 2) that Sipylus was once Phrygian. We shall hereafter see the close connexion[2] that existed between the Lycians and the people who are generally called the Trojans, and we may perhaps gather from the authorities we have quoted that it was the Trojans and the confederate races who were chiefly instrumental in driving the Phrygians from the eastern coasts of the Egean.

The struggling Phruges, when hard pressed by the foreigners who had invaded their country, seem in many cases to have followed the same course as their ancestors the Kimmerioi, and passed over into Greece. Among the most celebrated of the immigrants was Pelops. We are told by Thucydides (1. 9) that he brought great wealth with him and thereby obtained influence in Greece though a foreigner. Apollonius Rhodius makes him a Paphlagonian (2. 558), a notion which, as we have seen, was adopted by Diodorus (4. 74). But Greek legend generally connects him with Lydia; and Athenaeus (14. 21) tells us he was

[1] Vide Chap. VIII. [2] Ib.

followed both by Phruges and Ludoi, the latter the inhabitants of the Lydian city Sipylus, and the former the subjects of Tantalos his father. The followers of Pelops were probably none of them Lydians; but Mount Sipylus was once Phrygian (Str. 12. 8. 2, p. 571), and hence probably came the mistake into which Athenaeus has fallen. He tells us also (14. 21) that everywhere in the Peloponnesus, and especially in Lacedaemon[1], you might see great tumuli which they called the graves of the Phruges that followed Pelops. There is legendary authority for saying that the Briges of Macedonia were also carried into Greece by one of these later waves of Phrygian immigration, for we are told by Nicander in a passage quoted from his Geōrgika by Athenaeus (15. 31) that Midas, the mythical king of Phrygia, migrated from Asia into Emathia.

We are led both by mythus and legend to infer a very early connection between Phrygia and the west of Europe. According to the Theogony, 287, Kallirrhoē, daughter of Ocean, was mother of Geruōn and Ekhidna. The triple-headed Geruōn lived at Erutheia near Cadiz, and owned the cattle which Heraklēs carried off. Ekhidna, half woman half serpent, was confined underground among 'the Arimoi,' and bore to Tuphaōn Orthros the watchdog of Geruōn, Kerberos the watchdog of Hades, the Lernaean Hydra, and the Chimaira. The dwelling assigned to Ekhidna was no doubt the Katakekaumenē or volcanic region of Phrygia, and thus we find the mythologist of the Theogony connecting this Phrygian district with the country round Cadiz. Again, according to the ancient poem we have quoted (Theog. 274), 'the Gorgons that dwell beyond the far-famed Ocean,' and also the Hesperian dragon (Theog. 333) were the children of Phorkus, and as Homer (Il. 2. 862) introduces Phorkus as the name of a Phrygian chief,

[1] The remote date assigned to the arrival of Pelops in the Peloponnesus appears from the legends current respecting Theseus. This mythical hero is commonly represented as the grandson of Pittheus King of Troezen (Paus. 2. 30), Pittheus being the son of Pelops.

it would seem to be the design of the mythologist to assign also a Phrygian origin to these fabled beings of the West.

The story Herodotus tells us (2. 2), of the attempt made to test the relative antiquity of the Egyptians and the Phrygians, is important as showing the remote origin which in his day was assigned to the people he called the Phruges. It is not improbable that this people had occupied the high table-land forming the interior of Asia Minor from a period not very long subsequent to the Deluge. At what time they assumed the name of Phruges it is not easy to say. The name was familiar to Homer, and in his day must have been of old standing among the people. Briges, as we have seen, was the Macedonian form of the word, and the people who bore the name of Briges most probably migrated into Macedonia before the conquest of Thrace[1] by the Teukroi and Musoi (vide Ch. VIII), which cannot be well placed later than the year 1300 B.C. Midas the mythical king of the Briges is said to have migrated to Emathia just as Pelops is said to have migrated to the Peloponnesus.

Bochart supposes that in the name Gomer there is a reference to the Katakekaumenē, that is to the volcanic or burnt district of Phrygia, and would connect it with a Syriac word signifying 'burnt.' I am not a believer in his etymology; but there are grounds for believing that the district in question played an important part in the ancient history of Phrygia, and did actually give a name to a certain portion of the people called by the Greeks Kimmerioi. In the passage already quoted[2] from the Odyssey (11. 13) the scholiast in place of Kimmerioi gives us a varied reading, Kerberioi, which was supported by the high authority of Crates; and Pliny (6. 6) tells us that Cim-

[1] Some four or five centuries after the Trojan war the Briges were driven from Emathia, and returned to their old seats in Asia, where they founded the 'Lesser Phrygia.' If the speculation I have elsewhere started relative to the origin of Cimmeris in that district be correct, the Briges had not lost all recollection of their old name Kimmerioi when they settled in the Troad.

[2] Vide p. 8.

merium on the Cimmerian Bosphorus was in ancient times called Cerberium. Charon's demand in 'The Frogs' (v. 187) will furnish us with another example of the name—

> 'Who's for the plains of Lethe, or for the Ass-shearing,
> Or for the Kerberioi, or for the Crows?' &c.

Critics will have it that Kerberioi in this passage is a fictitious name invented by Aristophanes, but the name was no doubt in use ages before he existed. Strabo (12. 8. 21) makes mention of a pit in Phrygia called Kerbēsios which emitted pestilential vapours, and refers to a people bearing this name as one of the extinct races of Phrygia. As the letters *s* and *r* so often interchange in language, there is a fair presumption that Kerberioi was merely a varied form of the name Kerbesioi. The Theogony represents Kerberos as the son of Tuphaōn and Ekhidna; and one of the places in which the thunder-stricken Tuphon was said to be confined was the Katakekaumenē (Strab. 12. 8. 19). It is not improbable that such of the Kimmerioi as more particularly attracted the attention of the early Greeks, came from this volcanic neighbourhood, and took from it the name Kerbēsioi or Kerberioi. The physical peculiarities of the district may in like manner have furnished a name for the many-headed Cerberus, the watchful guardian of Hades. The many ties which connect the early Celts with the peculiar imagery and phraseology prevalent among the Greeks with respect to the regions of the dead is very remarkable. It may be explained by supposing that it was chiefly the pressure of Grecian tribes which drove the Celts from Greece, and afterwards from Italy. As in Britain our ancestors very commonly adopted the burial-places of the Celtic tribes they displaced, so the Greeks may have inherited places which Celtic superstition had already made sacred, and with the places may have inherited some portions of Celtic mythology. The Celts continued down to a late period to be distinguished for their worship of the infernal powers. Caesar tells us 'all

the Gauls declare they are descended from Dis Pater, and this they say has been handed down by the Druids' (B. G. 6. 18). According to Egyptian story (Tac. Hist. 4. 83) one of the early Ptolemies, as he was intent on embellishing his capital, was accosted by a heavenly visitor, and told by him to fetch his image from Pontus, and it would be a pledge for the prosperity of the city. On inquiry it was found that in the neighbourhood of Sinope was a temple which, according to old report, belonged to Jupiter Dis, for beside him was a female figure called Proserpina. After much resistance on the part of the people the coveted idol was secured and brought to Alexandria. A magnificent temple was erected for it on a spot where of old had stood a 'sacellum' dedicated to Serapis and Isis; and here was located the God, whose name of Serapis fills such a space in history. Plutarch in his work on Isis and Osiris says that when the image arrived at Alexandria certain experts were consulted, among whom was one of the Eumolpidai, the family who so long discharged the priestly duties at Eleusis. They concluded from the presence of the Kerberos and the Serpent, that the image belonged to Pluto, and persuaded Ptolemy that it was the representation of Serapis, this being the name which the Egyptians gave to Pluto[1]. Plutarch pronounces Osiris to be the same as Dionusos, and Serapis as Osiris. According to Clemens Alexandrinus (1. p. 43) Serapis was painted black; and as Clemens had probably in view the great idol of his own city, we may perhaps conclude that the Jupiter Dis brought from Sinope was painted this colour.

Sinope was situated in Paphlagonia, and near this town the Kimmerioi settled after their invasion of Asia Minor (Herod. 4. 12). The story of the Jupiter Dis, thus carried away from Sinope to Alexandria, in some degree corroborates the statement of Caesar; and I think we may conclude that from a very early period of their history the Celts were devoted to the superstition he ascribes to them. It may

[1] De Is. et Osiride, 361.

have been encouraged by their residence in the volcanic district of the Katakekaumenē, but its origin, I think, must be traced to Egypt. The Greeks long regarded the western district whither the Celts retired as the abode of the infernal powers, and in the Celtic dialects we meet with words which recall the names that figure in the Greek description of Hades. The Breton adjective *akr*, hideous, frightful, may probably be the root of Acheron; and the Irish *tor*, fear or dread, may by reduplication have given rise to the name of Tartar-os.

The oath considered to be most binding upon Hērē was by 'the gods beneath, around Kronos;' and to silence the doubts and scruples of Somnus, she invoked 'all the gods below Tartaros, who are called Titēnes' (Il. 14. 279). In the Iliad (8. 677) Zeus tells her,

> 'Thee and thine anger I reck not;
> Not, though thou goest to the furthest limit
> Of land and sea, where Japetos and Kronos
> Sit, and are blest neither with the rays of the sun Hyperion,
> Nor with the winds—but around them is Tartaros profound.'

In the Homeric hymn to Apollo (335) we find the Goddess again calling on these awful powers:—

> 'Hear me now, Earth and Heaven wide-spread above,
> And the Titan-gods that dwell the earth beneath
> In mighty Tartaros, from whom come both men and gods,' &c.

In the Theogony (632) we are told that the Titan gods on mount Othrus for ten whole years withstood the gods of Olympus. The range of Olympus shuts in Thessaly to the north, and that of Othrus to the south, so that the rival deities are here represented as contending for the possession of Thessaly. According to Diodorus (5. 66) the Cretans reported that in the time of the Curetes, the Titans Kronos and Hyperion, Koios and Japetos, Krios, Okeanos, and others, dwelt in the Knōssian land in Crete; and that the eldest, Kronos, reigned prosperously over the western districts, and therefore was much honoured by the Romans, Carthaginians, and other western nations. The historian elsewhere (3. 60), on the same authority, represents Kronos

as reigning in Sikelia, Libya, and Italia, but defeated by Zeus, although Kronos had the Titans for his allies.

It is not easy to interpret these mythi satisfactorily; but it seems clear that in the Homeric age the Titans were looked upon as having yielded indeed to the superior power of Zeus, but as still existing in the far west and exercising a mysterious influence over the fortunes both of gods and men. The most natural interpretation of the mythus seems to be, that some new *cultus*, or some new phase of civilization, gained an ascendancy over ancient habits of thought and feeling, which, however, still retained their hold upon mankind in the remoter districts of the world. We know that the worship of Kronos or Saturn was long the popular religion of Italy. Virgil calls Italy the Saturnian land (Georg. 2. 173); and the names Opikoi and Osci, which were given by the Greeks and Romans respectively to a large section of the population of Italy, meant simply the Saturnians[1], that is, men who followed the old rites, handed down to them by their forefathers. How far these rites could be considered as characteristic of particular *races* is a different question, and one somewhat difficult to answer. The terms Opikoi and Osci as used in Greek and Latin history certainly denoted races that were akin to the Greeks; but it will be the more prudent course to treat these notices of the Titanic powers as referring *generally* to the powers of the western world.

Cretan legend made Kronos the lord of the West, and the Titans his allies; and Callimachus gives this name of Titans to the Celts who attacked Delphi, 279 B.C. He introduces Apollo as foretelling the time

> 'When against the Greeks
> Raising the barbaric sword and Keltic war,
> Late-born Titēnes from the furthest West
> Shall rush.'—Hymn to Delos, 174.

The mythus which derived the Galatai or Celts from Galatos son of Galatea (vid. Etym. Magnum, Galatea), and which Appian followed when he derived Celts, Illyrians,

[1] See below, p. 93.

and Galatai from Polyphemus and Galatea (De Reb. Illyricis, p. 757), seems to admit of explanation on the same hypothesis, for Sicily, the home of these mythic personages, is expressly mentioned as one of the districts in which the Titans flourished.

The Arimoi are mentioned both in the Iliad and in the Theogony, and in both poems seem to be located in the Katakekaumenē or volcanic district of Phrygia. This district, according to Hesychius (Einarimois), was once called Arima, and here, according to the Lydian historian Xanthus (Str. 13. 4. 11), once reigned a king named Arimous. The earliest notice of the Arimoi connects them with the fable of Typhon and his monstrous progeny. When the Greeks marched onwards, we are told (Il. 2. 781)—

> 'The earth groaned under them, as when thunder-loving Zeus
> Is angry and smites the earth round about Tuphoēus
> In the land of the Arimoi (ein Arimois), where they say is the bed of Tuphoēus,
> So under their feet groaned heavily the earth
> As they came.'

Ekhidna, according to the Theogony (304), was imprisoned underground 'among the Arimoi' and bore to 'Tuphaōn' Cerberus, the Lernaean Hydra, and the Khimaira, which Bellerophontes slew. From the mention of the names of these monsters, it is clear that the authors of the Theogony intended to locate the Arimoi in the volcanic region of Phrygia, above alluded to, and such, doubtless, was the intention of Homer. But in later ages other volcanic districts were selected for the prison of the rebel Tuphon. Pindar (Str. 13. 4. 6, p. 627) confined him under Etna, and Latin poets confined him under the neighbouring island called Inarime, a blundered name evidently manufactured out of the Homeric phrase 'ein Arimois,' while some localized the story of Tuphon and the Arimoi in another volcanic district, viz. the valley of the upper Orontes (Str. 16. 2. 7). The connexion of the Arimoi with the legends relating to Tuphon tends to show that it was Egyptian influences that first carried the Arimoi westward.

We have hitherto looked on Celtic history from an eastern point of view, let us now see what shape it will take when we make the west our standing point. About the year 600 B.C. the Greeks founded the colony of Marseilles, and it was in the neighbourhood of this colony that the Keltoi, or, as the Latins called them, the Celtae, first received their name. Strabo (4. 1. 1) makes the Cevennes the boundary between the Keltoi[1] and the Akuatanoi; and he tells us (4. 1. 14) that the inhabitants of Narbonitis, that is of the Roman province lying chiefly in the southern basin of the Rhone, were from the first called Keltoi, and expresses his opinion that the Greeks gave the name to all the kindred tribes, owing to the celebrity of this people, or that the colonists of Marseilles did so owing to their living in the neighbourhood of the colony. The name is certainly Celtic; the Welsh word *celt* signifies a covert, and *Celtiaid*, which is formed from it according to a well-known analogy, means the people of the forest, the Celts. The name was probably given by the natives, who adopted the refinements of Greek civilization, to the ruder tribes around them who rejected its influences. The name when first imposed must have been equivalent to the term *barbarians*, but may have been accepted by those who bore it as a symbol of their freedom and independence.

The commercial activity of Marseilles seems to have made the name of Keltoi widely known at a very early period. In the fifth century B.C., Herodotus used it as a general name for all the tribes we now call Celtic. He tells us (2. 2) 'that the river Ister (Danube) beginning from among the Keltoi and the city Purēnē runs through the midst of Europe and divides it. But the Keltoi live beyond the columns of Hercules (Straits of Gibraltar) and adjoin to the Kunēsioi, who of all the inhabitants of Europe dwell the furthest towards the setting sun.' In the Melpomene (4. 49) he somewhat varies the statement. 'The Ister flows through the whole of Europe, taking its rise among the

[1] See below, p. 73.

Keltoi, who of all the people of Europe dwell the furthest towards the setting sun, next after the Kunētes.' Stephanus Byzantinus tells us that 'Kunētikon was a place in Iberia near the Ocean,' and that the inhabitants were called Kunētes and Kunēsioi; so that the text of Herodotus is not necessarily blundered, though he assigns this people different names in the two extracts we have quoted. Festus Avienus (Ora Mar. 205) makes the Ana (the Guadiana) flow through the country of the Cynetes; and Justin (44. 4) makes the Cynetes[1] dwell in the forest of the Tartessi, which must have stretched between the Guadiana and the Guadalquiver. Herodorus (Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Glētes) mentions the Glētes as an Iberian people coming after the Cunētes. The Glētes must be the Iglētes of Strabo (3. 4. 19, p. 166) and there seems ground for believing that the Ibēres dwelling between the Straits and the Ebro were divided into two tribes, the Iglētes and the Kunētes. The notion entertained by some of our English writers that the Kunētes were the men of Kent hardly needs a refutation.

The fact that Herodotus (2. 29) converts Purēnē (the Pyrenees) into a city, and supposes the Danube to rise in its neighbourhood, shows us how little he knew of the interior of Europe. Aristotle's knowledge of the subject must have been equally limited (vid. Meteor. I. 13). It is, however, clear that Herodotus, and therefore probably his contemporaries, considered the Keltoi to reach from the Danube to the western ocean; and there is certainly reason to believe that the greater part of this vast tract of country was actually peopled by Celtic races.

It is at first startling to find that Dio Cassius, who flourished at the close of the second century, calls the Germans Keltoi, and that he thus distinguishes them from their Gallic neighbours. The term Keltoi originally signified the native tribes that dwelt in the forest[2]. As the

[1] The MSS. have Curētes, but Vossius substituted for it the reading Cunētes, and his correction has been very generally accepted.

[2] Vide p. 36.

Gauls became gradually Romanized the name seems to have been given to the remoter tribes who were not yet brought under the influence of Roman civilization, and at last came to designate the rude races settled beyond the Rhine.

After the third century B.C. the name Keltoi was generally superseded in Greek literature by the term Galatai. The origin of this term is obscure. Though accepted by the Greeks, it never passed into Roman usage, and certain passages, that apparently assert the contrary, admit of explanation. The Romans on their part had a name (Galli) for the Celtic race which was never generally adopted by the Greeks. The origin of this name Galli has never yet been explained, though I cannot help thinking that it admits of an explanation which is a satisfactory one.

At the beginning of the fifth century B.C. various tribes dwelling north of the Alps began to cross the mountains. One after another they made good their footing in the south, Ædui, Cenomanni, Lingones, Senones, &c., till the whole plain of the Po was covered with their settlements. Livy, himself a native of these parts, describes the invasions (5. 34). It would seem that some of the tribes the invaders met were more or less akin to them; for we read that the Ædui met with a people called the Insubres, which was the name of one of their own clans (pagi). The Etruscans, hitherto the dominant race in the country, were either exterminated or driven to the mountains, and before many years were passed the Romans themselves were involved in the turmoil, and fighting for their very existence as a nation. Never had the great city to contend against a fiercer enemy, and it was only after a warfare of some two centuries' duration that it was able to subdue them. These terrible strangers were the Galli.

Caesar is the earliest extant author who gives to the word Galli the meaning it now bears. But that the name was current in Roman usage before his time is certain. Cicero, when speaking of the Cisalpine Gauls and their country, uses the names Galli and Gallia, as if they were

familiar terms of long standing in the language; and on the Æmilian Way, some seventeen miles north of Bologna, was a place called 'Forum Gallorum,' and it probably bore that name when the highway was constructed some 180 years B.C. The district conquered from the Senones 289 years B.C. was called 'the Gallic district,' and we may fairly infer that it was so called when first parcelled out among the Roman colonists. Again, the Fasti Capitolini record a triumph over the Galli under a date which answers to 224 B.C. It is true the monument which preserves the entry cannot date earlier than the reign of Tiberius; but from the general style of the entries there is reason to believe they were copies, either literal or slightly altered, of others more ancient, which may have been coeval with, or only a little posterior to the events they commemorate. I think there can be little doubt that these foreign adventurers were known to the Romans by the name of Galli as early as the third century B.C.; and it does not seem difficult to assign a meaning to the term Galli—one indeed so obvious, that I have always felt surprise that it should have escaped notice. The men who thus measured their national strength with that of Rome were settled on both sides of the Po, in the celebrated plain, which has so often been the battle-field of Europe; and they called themselves the men of the *gal*[1] or plain, in contradistinction to the Ligures of the mountains and the Veneti of the sea-coast.

That the name of Galli passed from the Cisalpine to the Transalpine Gauls is a conclusion that seems to follow directly from Caesar's narrative. When he invaded the country north of the Alps, which he called Gallia, he found there tribes bearing the same names, Lingones, Senones, Cenomanni, &c., and doubtless speaking the same language as the Gaulish tribes he had left on the banks of the Po, and he would naturally look upon them as the same people. They called themselves Celtae, and Caesar (B. G. 1. 1) represents them as strangers to the name of Galli.

[1] Vide O. Pugh's Welsh Dict. as to the proper meaning of this word *gal*.

This latter name Caesar assigned specially to the tribes which dwelt between the Seine and the Garonne. It was among them that he found the tribal names which prevailed among the Galli in the plain of the Po, and he called them Galli, though they gave themselves the name of Celtae. We must not infer from their assumption of the name of Celtae that they were rude tribes dwelling in the forest[1]. They had walled towns and had certainly made considerable advances in civilization; but the name of Celtae had come in the course of time to signify those who rejected Greek and Roman influence, and was no doubt adopted by them as a proof of their independence.

Caesar includes under the name of Gallia the districts inhabited by the Aquitani and the Belgae. It would not be a strained inference to suppose that he considered these two races to be more or less akin to the Galli. Indeed, he actually refers to the Volcae Tectosages (B.G. 6. 24), the Morini, and the Menapii (B. G. 3. 28) as Galli, though we have the clearest evidence that they were all three Belgic races. Both the Aquitani and the Belgae may have differed in language from the Galli sufficiently to be unintelligible to that people, and yet have spoken Celtic dialects; just as the Irish, or to put a stronger case, just as the Bretons, are unintelligible to the Welsh, and yet are acknowledged by all philologists to speak a kindred language, and to be of kindred origin. Among the *later* Romans the term Galli was used with a greater latitude of meaning, indeed, as a mere synonym for the term Celtae.

That we have here the true explanation of the name Galli I cannot doubt, and I do not hesitate to say, that I consider the notions generally entertained as to its origin to be little creditable to modern scholarship. They rest mainly on the assumption that the word Gael is identical with Gall-us. A very little scholarship is sufficient to shew how unfounded the assumption really is. The word which we write Gael is the Irish Gaoidheal. According to a rule

[1] Vide p. 36 as to the origin of the name of Celtae.

widely prevalent in the Irish language, the middle consonant is dropped when the word is spoken, and an Irishman would give to Gaoidheal a pronunciation not very unlike Gael. But that the middle consonant was pronounced a few centuries ago is clear from the form the word takes when latinized by the writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, viz. Gaithelus. The Welsh call the Irishman Gwyddel; and that Gwyddel, Gaoidheal and Gaithel-us all represent the same word cannot reasonably be doubted. We have but to trace the word Gael a few centuries back, and all resemblance between it and Gall-us disappears. No blunder connected with ancient history has led to more serious errors than the one we are now considering, and it is humiliating to think how many men of literary name and position have sanctioned it[1].

There is a people often represented as being a distinct race, who were, I believe, closely connected in their ethnology both with the Galli of whom we have been speaking and with the Cimmerioi whose origin was discussed at the beginning of the chapter. The Cimbri first appear in Roman history in the year 113 B.C., when they defeated the Consul Papirius Carbo in Noricum, between the Danube and the Alps. They then carried devastation through Gaul and Spain, till they were exterminated at Vercellae by Marius, in the year 101 B.C. Historians in referring to their origin, generally trace them to the Cimbric Chersonesus, in the neighbourhood of which a people bearing the same name were settled in the days of Tacitus (Germ. 37). That they came from the borders of the German Ocean cannot, I think, be doubted. The Belgae boasted (B.G. 2, 4) that they were the only people of Gaul that prevented the entrance of the Cimbri and Teutoni within their borders. Now, if we suppose that the Cimbri and their neighbours the Teutoni left the borders of the

[1] Thierry, Niebuhr, Mommsen! Our English compilers generally follow in the same track. They think they must needs be in safety if they shelter themselves under Niebuhr's mantle.

German Ocean—whether driven from it by an inundation of the sea or not we need not stop to inquire—the first people they would come into contact with in their progress southwards would be the Belgae, and if the invaders were unable to penetrate the Belgic frontier they would naturally be diverted eastward towards the country where they met the Roman consul and defeated him.

That the Cimbri *were* thus brought into contact with the Belgae is certain, for Caesar (B. G. 2. 29) found somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Sambre and the Meuse a people said to be the descendants of 6000 men left by the Cimbri and Teutoni to guard their herds and baggage when they marched onwards. It appears therefore that the Belgae, though they would not allow the Cimbri to cross their border, allowed them to deposit within it their cattle and other valuables. But the strongest proof that—I do not say the Cimbric Chersonesus but—the seaboard of the German Ocean was the original seat of the Cimbri whom Marius defeated, is the fact that Cimbri inhabiting a portion of this district actually sent an embassy to Augustus, soliciting his good-will and pardon for the injuries their countrymen had inflicted on the Roman province (Strabo 7. 2. 1). The questions however relating to the origin of the Cimbri are too important to be dismissed thus summarily. We will give at length some of the notices respecting them which are to be met with in the classical writers.

According to Plutarch (Marius 16), after the capture of Jugurtha 'there came rumours of the Teutonoi and Kimbroi, such as at first caused a disbelief as to the number and strength of the invading armies, but which afterwards appeared less than the reality; for of armed men fit for battle there marched thirty myriads[1], and a greater number of children and women it was said was brought with them; and they were seeking a land that could support so great a multitude, and cities where they might settle and live,

[1] 300,000.

just as before their time the Keltoi, as they had heard, appropriated the best part of Italia after taking it from the Turrhēnoi (Etruscans). Owing to their little intercourse with other races, and the extent of country they had traversed, it was not known what men they were or whence sprung, that thus hung like a cloud over Italia and Galatia[1]; and generally from the size of their bodies, and their light eyes, and because the Germans call robbers Kimbroi, they were supposed to be Germanic races, some of those that were settled on the Northern Ocean. But there are those who say that the Keltic country (Keltikē) from the depth of the district and its extent stretches from the outer sea and the Arctic regions, and reaches to the Pontic Scythia; and that this people emigrating thence, not at one single movement, nor in a continuous stream, but always pushing forwards every year at the proper season, overran the continent in hostile fashion at many different times; wherefore, though they had in turn many appellations, the army was called by a common name Kelto-Skuthai[2].

'But others say, that of the Kimmerioi known of old to the Greeks, it was no large portion that passed over from the Maiōtis to Asia under the conduct of Lugdamis, but only fugitives and insurgents overpowered by the Skuthai, and that the larger and more warlike portion dwell in the farthest coasts, and inhabit a land cloudy and woody and sunless, owing to the depth and thickness of the forests, which they say reach in the interior as far as the Hercunia; and that they have a climate where the pole, attaining a great height on account of the declension of the parallels, is but little distant from the point that serves as a zenith to the inhabitants; and that days and nights equal in duration divide the year between them; and moreover that abundance of matter was thus furnished to Homer for his Nekuia[3]. From thence, say they, came the attack upon Italy by these barbarians, who were first

[1] i.e. Gaul.
[2] As to the origin and proper significance of this term, vide Chap. IV.
[3] As to the Nekuia, vide p. 8.

called Kimmerioi, but afterwards, without much change in the pronunciation, Kimbroi. These things, however, are related rather as matter of conjecture than as trustworthy history.' I would dwell awhile on the inferences that may be drawn from the statements contained in this extract.

In Greek history we find frequent mention made of a mountain-range called the Hercynian, and also of a Hercynian forest, and it has been conjectured that the name is connected with the Welsh word *erchynu*, to elevate. We may form a rough notion of the geography of this Hercynian district if we suppose it to stretch from the borders of the Black Forest, east of Frankfort, to and along the mountains of Bohemia, then along the Moravian highlands and the Carpathians, and then gradually to die away on the plains of Wallachia. Caesar, with much exaggeration, estimates its width at nine days' journey, and its length at sixty (B.G. 6. 25), and carries it from the borders of the Helvetii and Rauraci to those of the Daci. It was no doubt a long line of mountain-forest running from west to east and occasionally throwing off branches to the north and south, and it must have presented an almost insurmountable barrier in the way of any large body of men attempting to cross it. The only available routes to the West of Europe must have lain either north of this wooded range or south of it along the valley of the Danube; and by the first of these the descendants of Gomer must have travelled if they ever spread from the steppes of Southern Russia, i.e. from the 'Pontic Scythia' to the Cimbric Chersonesus, i.e. to our modern Jutland. We may suppose that at some remote period 'Gomer and all his bands' crossed the Danube and journeyed northwards along the Dnieper to the Ukraine, sending off a colony eastward to the Crimea, and from the Ukraine working their way gradually westward across the head waters of the Vistula to the Elbe, and so to the Western Ocean. The Teutons seem to have followed at a later period—it may be many centuries later—by the same route,

and breaking through the line of Celtic settlement, to have pushed the Celts before them on their journey westward.

It will be seen that I adopt the opinions of the writers mentioned by Plutarch, who maintained that the Kimmerioi penetrated slowly from the Pontic Scythia, i.e. from the neighbourhood of the Euxine, to the Western Ocean—each tribe and family driving out their neighbours and seizing their lands as opportunity presented itself. The mistaken notion that these Kimmerioi were the people who are represented by Herodotus as having been expelled by the Skuthai, was a blunder not unlikely to occur. Their expulsion from the Crimea was one of the earliest facts which history had handed down respecting the Kimmerioi, and Greek speculation naturally connected it with their earliest settlement in the north of Europe. The two events may have been separated from each other by some centuries, but tradition generally represents remote events as contemporaneous.

As it is important to compare the different opinions ancient authors have entertained with respect to these matters, I will give at some length the views which Strabo (7. 2. 1.) has put forward on this subject.

'Of the Kimbroi some things are reported incorrectly, but other things are told of them which have much plausibility. No one would admit that the cause of their becoming wanderers and robbers was that they dwelt on a peninsula, and were driven out of the country by a great flood-tide; for they have even now the land they formerly possessed, and they sent as a present to Augustus a cauldron, which they accounted most sacred, soliciting his friendship, and pardon for what had occurred in times past, and, having obtained what they asked for, departed. It would moreover have been absurd to desert their country provoked by a natural and recurring phenomenon which happened twice every day; and that an extraordinary flood ever occurred has all the appearance of a fiction, for in such

phenomena the ocean exhibits an increase and decrease of energy according to a regular order and at regular times. That writer too is in error who says the Kimbroi take up arms against the flood; and also he who declares the Keltoi let their houses be swept away and then rebuild them, as if it were an exercise of their fortitude; and that more destruction comes on them from water than from war—as Ephorus tells us; for the regularity of the flood-tides, and the fact that the flooded district is well known will not allow of these marvels. As the phenomenon happens twice a day, how is it credible that they never saw that the ebb and flow was natural and harmless, and happened not to them only but to all the dwellers on the ocean? Nor is Cleitarchus right when he says there are horsemen who, seeing the approach of the sea, have galloped off and have thus barely escaped being overtaken. We know the advance of the sea comes not thus suddenly, but as it were stealthily, and that which happens every day and is heard before it is seen cannot cause such terror that they should fly as if it had fallen out unexpectedly.

'These views of our historians Poseidonius justly censures, and he conjectures, not unreasonably, that the Kimbroi were freebooters and wanderers that made an expedition to the district round the Maiōtis, and that the Kimmerian Bosphorus was named from them, as though it were the *Kimbric*—the Greeks having called the Kimmerioi Kimbroi. And he says also that the Boioi formerly inhabited the Herkunian forest, and that the Kimbroi, having made an attack on that district and being driven back by the Boioi upon the Ister (Danube), came down upon the Skordiskoi Galatai, then upon the Teuristai and Tauriskoi who also were Galatai, then upon the Helouēttioi (Helvetii) a wealthy people but a peaceful one, and that the Helouēttioi, seeing the wealth obtained by a predatory people exceeding their own, became excited, especially the Tigurēnoi and Tōugenoi, and joined the expedition. But all were destroyed by the Romans, the Kimbroi themselves and those who had asso-

ciated themselves with them—some after they had passed the Alps into Italia and the others beyond the Alps' (Strabo 7. 2. 1, 2).

In the passage here quoted Strabo evidently mixes up his own speculations with those of Poseidonius. Let us endeavour to distinguish between the speculations of the critic and the statements of the author he is criticizing.

Strabo will not admit the old story, that the Kimbroi were driven from their country by an irruption of the sea, because, as he states, they had sent an embassy to Augustus, and it appeared they were still living in their old settlements. But there is reason to believe that the district they then lived in formed but a small part of the country inhabited by their ancestors. Before their descent upon the Roman provinces the settlements of the Kimbroi probably stretched along the Western Ocean, from modern Jutland to the Rhine. In the time of Tacitus they were, according to the construction generally put upon that author, living in the Cimbric Chersonesus, though Strabo seems to have located them between the Rhine and the Elbe (7. 1. 3). It may probably have been the Kimbroi here settled that sent the embassy to Augustus.

Poseidonius, on the other hand, refused to admit the story, because he considered it inconsistent with that course of regular action which, as he thought, characterized the tides. Unlike his successor Strabo, whose experience was confined to the Mediterranean, *he* had seen the tides of the Atlantic, and no doubt supposed he might safely argue from the phenomenon he had observed at Cadiz. Our larger experience enables us to form juster conclusions. *We* know the perils that may follow a high tide in the German Ocean, though I believe even scientific men have as yet only imperfectly estimated the ravages which the tidal currents of that ocean have wrought, and are still working, on our Eastern coasts and on the coasts opposite.

The testimony of Ephorus, based probably on the reports of the Phoenician traders, shows us that two or three centu-

ries before the irruption which drove out the Kimbroi, the ocean had been sweeping away the low drift-lands on which they dwelt. For ages the great rivers, the Rhine, the Elbe, &c., had been quietly depositing the silt with which they were charged in the ocean—what were the altered conditions which stopped any farther accretion and enabled the ocean in some measure to regain the territory it had lost? For more than 2000 years it has now been eating into the land and obliterating the landmarks of history; whence originates the altered action that led to these results? A sinking, or it may be repeated sinkings, of the sea-bottom would account for this revolution; and such a hypothesis would be quite consistent with recent observations[1]. If we adopt it, the date may be comparatively recent when Britain was separated from the mainland of Europe.

The remaining notices which Strabo has extracted from Poseidonius will require consideration hereafter. At present they are of value only as they bear on the question whether Kimbroi and Kimmerioi were varied forms of the same name, and consequently the Kimbroi and Kimmerioi originally the same people. As regards these matters we find that the opinion of Poseidonius was the same as that afterwards entertained by Diodorus (5. 32), by Strabo (7. 2. 2), and apparently by Plutarch[2]. We must not conclude that this was merely a speculation of Poseidonius adopted by later compilers. It is clear from Plutarch that the question had been much canvassed by Greek writers, and that different hypotheses had been started to account for the identity of the two races. According to one hypothesis the Kimmerioi at some distant period, 'not at one single movement nor in a continuous stream[3],' but gradually, pushed their way from the Euxine to the German Ocean; according to another a portion of the Kimmerioi who were expelled by the Skuthai went northwards and became the ancestors of the Kimbroi. The expulsion of the Kimmerioi by the Skuthai was too recent to allow of

[1] Vide Chap. IV. [2] Vide p. 42. [3] Vide p. 43.

that complete colonization of the North-West of Europe which we know was effected by the Kimbroi at a very early date. This consideration seems to have been the chief reason why modern inquirers have so persistently denied the identity of the two races. But the objection has no weight as against the first hypothesis, and I confess that such hypothesis seems to me to be the only one which can reconcile the statements of Greek history with the conclusions of modern criticism.

The fortunes of the Cimbri, after they had reached the Western Ocean, are not difficult to follow. From Jutland a line of salt marshes ran southward to the Somme. As far back as history reaches—that is, as far back as the fourth century B.C. when Ephorus flourished—we find the ocean eating its way into these marshes; and millions of acres must have been swallowed up before its inroads were checked by the industry of man. On these rich but treacherous netherlands the Cimbri appear to have multiplied, and to have sent forth their teeming multitudes over sea to Britain, and southward along the coast to Gaul. The latter country, at the early period we are dealing with, was probably covered with unbroken forest, save where it was intersected by the great rivers that drained it. Along the line of these rivers the tribes of the sea coast must have pushed their way inland, till they came into contact with, and felt the influence of the civilization which followed in the track of the trader from the Mediterranean. It is in the islands, and in the coast districts of Normandy and Brittany that we find the long stone avenues, the gigantic stone circles, and the other monuments which are generally supposed to be characteristic of Celtic antiquity, and which by their rude vastness still astonish the traveller. As we ascend the rivers the *menhirs*, *cromlechs*, &c. become rarer and rarer, till they gradually disappear. These remnants of Celtic barbarism seem to have been gradually discarded, as the people who reared them approached the south of Europe. They probably looked upon the tribes they had left behind

them on the sea-coast as little better than barbarians, long before they had felt the influences of Greek and Roman civilization. Phoenician traders had penetrated into the country before Marseilles was founded, and to these adventurers we owe the earliest legends that have come down to us respecting Gaul. They were the first specimen of a civilized people, with which the Cimbri could have come into contact, and it must have been Eastern culture that first softened Cimbric barbarism. Whether civilization first reached Britain by way of Gaul, or came to it more directly from the seaboard, are questions we may have to discuss hereafter. They are questions as difficult as they are obscure.

CHAPTER II.

THE Ibēres the first of the early races that migrated westward; occupied the coasts of the Mediterranean from the mouths of the Rhone to the Straits. — Asiatic Ibēres now represented by the Georgians; a portion of this people probably expelled from the eastern coasts of the Euxine by the Colchians; may have penetrated into Europe by way of the Danube, and settled on the western coasts of the Mediterranean.

The Iberian Sikanoi driven from the basin of the Ebro by the Ligures, took refuge in Sicily. — The term Hispani first used in the second century B.C.; its derivation; Vascones the ancestors of the modern Basques; origin of the name. The derivation of the name Ibēres from Iberus (the Ebro) inadmissible; the Saspeires, Sapeires or Sabeires of Asia; Ibēres the Phocaean corruption of the name Sabeires; this pronunciation spread from the Phocaean colony of Marseilles, and gradually superseded the older Greek forms Sabeires, Sapeires, and Saspeires. — Tibarēnoi the proper national name of the Asiatic Ibēres; same as the Scriptural name Tubal. —The Moskhoi represented the people known in Scripture as Meshech; sometimes called Cappadoces, that is, the men of the Halys or Cappadox; origin of the word Cappadox. — The custom called the *couvade* common to the Basques and the Tibarēnoi. — Satrapies of Darius; the Saparda Satrapy the district lying immediately south of Caucasus; same as the Sepharad of the Jews; probably included their Casiphia; the Spanish Jews why called Sephardim.

Iberia used as a *general* name for Spain by the later classical writers. The Celtibēres a mixture of the Ibēres proper and Celts; the latter the predominant race. The Celtibērian conquests proceeded from the western coasts eastwards; did not reach the coasts of the Mediterranean till the fifth century B.C. — The Celtibēres completely Romanized after the Roman conquest; the chief source whence the modern Spaniards are derived. — The Aquitani, like the Celtibēres, a mixed people; like the Celtibēres completely Romanized after the Roman conquest; their country wasted, and then in part peopled by the Vascones of Spain in the sixth century; still occupied by two distinct races, the Basques and the Gascons; the former the descendants of the intrusive Vascones, the latter of the Romanized Aquitani; Fauriel's objections to this theory considered.

I HAVE stated my belief that the districts bordering on the Western Ocean were first colonized by Celtic races.

But there was another race of people, which seems to have preceded them in the migration westward, though they found a country to settle in before they reached the Atlantic. The name Ibēres does not occur in Greek literature before the time of Herodotus, but the people who bore it were probably settled on the western shores of the Mediterranean more than a thousand years previously. It is difficult to trace events so faintly recorded in history, but the inquiry is necessary, if it be merely to remove difficulties in the way of other investigations.

Modern writers are pretty well agreed in considering the Ibēres proper to be connected with that remarkable people who still retain their ancient language and many of their peculiar customs at the western extremity of the Pyrenees. So many probabilities concur in favour of this opinion, that I shall not scruple to use the word Basques when speaking of the ancient Ibēres or their descendants. The presumed identity of the two races will not, however, much assist us in our inquiry after the origin of the elder people. The ethnology of the Basques is singularly obscure, and the attempts which have been made to trace the affinities of their language have hitherto met with but little success. The opinion, once prevalent, that it was connected with the Celtic dialects, has been long abandoned, and the notion of its relationship to the Finnish dialects seems to be equally unfounded. As far as the testimony of language goes, the Basques are a people isolated in Europe.

Polybius informs us (3. 37) that the whole eastern coast of the Peninsula, as far as the Straits, was called Iberia, but that the coast lying alongside the outer sea, i. e. alongside the Atlantic, had received no common name, as it had only lately been explored, and was inhabited by barbarous tribes. We must not interpret this passage too strictly. It is obvious that the coast north of Cadiz must have been for centuries familiarly known to the Phoenician

inhabitants of that town; and Ephorus (Strabo 4. 4. 6), probably on their authority, represented Keltikē, i. e. the Celtic district, as reaching as far south as Cadiz.

Eratosthenes also carried the Galatai (he uses the name as merely a synonym for the Keltoi) to the same well-known locality (Strabo 2. 4, p. 107); and so far, according to Josephus, the sons of Japhet penetrated westward.

To these Galatai no doubt belonged the barbarous tribes Polybius refers to. In assigning the Spanish coasts *east* of the Straits to the Ibēres, Polybius is in perfect agreement with Scylax the coast-describer, who, according to Niebuhr's criticism, must have written shortly before the age of Alexander. Starting eastward from the Straits, Scylax represents the Ibēres as the first people met with in Europe, and tells us that the coasting of Iberia as far as Emporion took seven days and seven nights; 'after the Ibēres follow the Ligues and mixed Ibēres as far as the river Rhone; the coasting from the Liguan Emporion to the river Rhone takes two days and one night.'

Emporion lay a little north of Barcelona, and in calling it the Liguan Emporion Scylax agrees with Thucydides, who represents the Iberian Sicanoi as having been expelled by the Ligues (Ligures) from the Sikanos, i. e. from the basin of the Ebro[1].

Next to the Ligues, who dwelt in the neighbourhood of this river, came the mixed Ibēres, who reached as far as the Rhone. Festus Avienus makes this river the dividing line betwen the Iberes and the Ligures, who inhabited the Alpine district—

> 'hujus (Rhodani) alveo
> Ibera tellus, atque Ligures asperi
> Intersecantur.'—Ora Maritima, 610.

We may now, perhaps, be better able to understand a passage in Strabo (3. 4. 19), which bears upon this subject. 'The whole country beyond the Rhone, &c. was called Iberia by the ancients, but men of the present day

[1] Thucydides, 6. 2. Vide post p. 57.

make Purēnē (the Pyrenees) the boundary, and call it Iberia and Hispania[1], as if the words were synonymous; some gave the name of Iberia only to the country that lay within the Ibēr (Ebro), and the older writers called the people Iglētes, &c. But the Romans have called the whole alike Iberia and Hispania.'

I believe this passage will bear the following paraphrase. Ancient Greek writers, knowing that Iberic tribes dwelt on the coast west of the Rhone, made Iberia begin with that river; but others, aware that these Ibēres were unimportant tribes subject to the more powerful races among whom they lived, and moreover that further south the Ibēres had been driven by the Ligues across the Ebro, made that river the boundary of Iberia; while the later Romans, neglecting all considerations of race, gave the names Iberia and Hispania to the whole country south of the Pyrenees, whether inhabited by Celts or Ibēres.

A people bearing the name of Ibēres once dwelt between the Euxine and the Caspian, and it is the general opinion that the modern Georgians are their descendants. In ancient times there was much difference of opinion as to the ethnology of these Asiatic Ibēres. Some considered them to be the ancestors, others the descendants[2] of the Spanish Ibēres, while a third party thought there was no connexion between the two races, as they differed both in manners and in language (Appian, Mithr. War, c. 101). Among the older Greeks the prevalent opinion certainly was that the two races were identical in origin: and the difference in their manners and customs need occasion little surprise, when we remember how long even at that early period the races had been separated from each other. Some scholars have endeavoured to trace analogies between the Basque and the modern dialect of Georgia, though they could hardly hope to find much resemblance between languages that had been subjected to different social and political influences for more than 3,000 years. Nevertheless, of all

[1] I follow Casaubon's correction. [2] See Strabo, 1. 3. 21, p. 61.

the attempts that have been made to settle the relations of the Basque language, this is the one which promises to lead to the most satisfactory results.

In the narrow slip of land separating the Asiatic Ibēres from the Euxine lived that ancient and mysterious people the Kolkhoi. From their swarthy complexion, their curly hair, their habit of circumcision, and their manufacture of a particular kind of linen, Herodotus (2. 104) drew the conclusion that they were of Egyptian origin. His testimony on these matters is valuable, for he seems to have visited the country. Not much less valuable is that of Strabo, who was born at no great distance from the borders of Kolkhis, and who (1. 3. 21, p. 61) describes the Kolkhoi, without any misgiving, as an Egyptian people. Arrian, who was a native of Bithynia, and therefore must have had good means of information, styles Kolkhis in his Periplus of the Euxine 'the other Aethiopia,' so that there can be no doubt that down to a late period Kolkhis was inhabited by a dark-coloured people; and I see no reason for doubting that these swarthy men drew their descent from Egypt. They must however have been settled on the Euxine from a period of the most remote antiquity, and I think we are justified in considering the Kolkhoi to have been one of those Egyptian settlements which were required to secure the conquests of the early Pharaohs.

We need not suppose that their connexion with Egypt was of long continuance. The foreign conquests of the early monarchies were seldom durable, and on the monuments we find Egyptian kings again and again warring against and subjugating the same people. The Kolkhoi obtained a degree of power which made them independent of Egyptian aid, and there is some authority for saying that at one time they were even at war with the parent-state. The settlement of this people on the eastern coast of the Euxine must almost necessarily have led to the displacement of a certain portion of the native race, and it would be quite consistent with all we know of ancient

history to suppose that the Ibēres on the coast took refuge in their ships, and sought a new country in the regions westward.

Apollonius Rhodius describes the Argonauts when flying before the vengeful Kolkhoi as sailing up the Danube, and so working their way to the Mediterranean. He seems to have looked upon the Danube and the great Mediterranean rivers, the Po, the Rhone, &c., as being like the seven mouths of the Nile, outlets of one great river, the drain of the unknown interior. The notion that the Danube emptied itself by one of its mouths into the Adriatic, was long entertained by geographers (Strabo 1. 2. 39, p. 46), and the question is discussed by Pliny (3. 22). Apollonius Rhodius probably borrowed his notions on this subject from the Alexandrian school to which he belonged, and they may have originated in a knowledge of the fact, that tribes of men living on the Po, the Rhone, &c. reached those districts by way of the Danube. It certainly is not an unreasonable hypothesis that such of the Ibēres as were displaced by the Kolkhoi migrated westward by this route, and there are grounds for believing that the Kolkhoi followed in the same track. Justin (32. 3) asserts that a body of the Colchi penetrated up the Danube and the Saave, and settled in Istria; and we have ample proof that the ancients attributed to them the foundation of several towns on the Adriatic. Pliny (3. 26) assigns to them the foundation of Olcinium in Dalmatia, and of Oricum in Epirus, to which place Apollonius Rhodius (4. 1216) carries a body of Kolkhoi; and Pola, whose ruins are still extant some sixty miles south of Trieste, was represented as a town of the Kolkhoi by Callimachus (Strabo 1. 2, p. 46), by Mela (2. 3. 13), and by Pliny (3. 23).

Thucydides (6. 2) informs us that certain Ibēres, who were driven from the river Sikanos, gave to Sicily the name of Sikania. Diodorus (5. 6) quotes Philistus the Sicilian historian to the same effect, but himself prefers the opinion of Timaeus, a Sicilian writer of later date, who

considered the Sikanoi to be an *indigenous* race in that island. In his comment on Aen. 8. 328, Servius tells us that 'according to some the Sicani were a people of Spain, and were named after the river Sichoris.' The Sichoris, now the Siegre, was one of the main feeders of the Ebro, and therefore, according to this authority, the Sikanoi must have occupied a portion of the basin of this last-named river.

Festus Avienus, after mentioning the cities Idera and Hemeroscopium, proceeds:

> 'Then the city Sicana shows itself;
> So called by the Iberici from the neighbouring river,
> And not far from the fork (divortium) of this river
> The river Tyrius encircles the town of Tyris.'
> Ora Maritima, 478.

It is well known that Festus Avienus drew his materials from ancient sources, and he is here evidently playing the part of an antiquary rather than of a geographer. It is difficult to fix the sites of the four towns he mentions; but Stephanus Byzantinus makes Dera, which must be the same place as Idera, 'a district of Ibēria, containing the river Sikanos;' and he quotes Hecataeus as his authority for describing Sikanē as 'a town of Ibēria.' It is probable that the river Sikanos, now the Siegre, was the branch of the Ebro best known to the ancient Ibēres, and that the name Sikanos at one time accompanied the river till it emptied itself into the Mediterranean; for nothing is more common than to find a river taking at different periods the names of its different branches. Sikanē may have been some town near the mouth of the Ebro, perhaps the Ibēra celebrated in the wars of the Scipios. The reader will hardly agree with Diodorus in preferring the opinion of Timaeus to that of Thucydides and Philistus. But the fact that it was entertained by so early a writer, himself a native of Sicily, shows us how remote must have been the date when the Ligues drove the Sikanoi from Spain.

Sicily is called Sikania in the Odyssey (24. 306) because

the Ibēres who inhabited it 'came from the river Sikanos,' as the scholiast informs us; and Ephorus (Strabo 6. 2. 4) pronounced the Ibēres, by which term he evidently meant the Ibērian Sikanoi, to be the most ancient of all the barbarians who dwelt in Sicily. The Sikanoi no doubt escaped to Sicily in their ships, according to the usual course followed in these early migrations (Tac. Germ. 2). Freret's notion (Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscr. 1749; t. xviii. p. 78) that they worked their way to Sicily through Gaul and Italy[1], though adopted by Niebuhr and Thierry, is so extravagant as hardly to need a refutation.

Hispania and Hispani are the only terms used by Caesar to denote the Peninsula and its inhabitants. The term Hispania is found in Maccabees, and the adverb Hispane in a fragment of Ennius. The name seems to have worked its way into Roman usage during the wars of the Scipios in Spain, and was probably borrowed, like so many other geographical terms, from the Greeks of Marseilles. Asterloa supposed that España (Spain) came from the Basque word Ezpaña, a lip, a border, the outer edge of anything, and that it denoted the position of the country lying on the sea at the extremity of Europe. W. Humboldt (Urbewohner Hispaniens, § 18) thought this hypothesis an unlikely one, and would rather consider España to be a corruption of the Latin Hispania. If the Basque word were the real origin of the name, it must have given rise to the Latin Hispania as well as to the Spanish España; and it does not seem difficult to suggest a mode by which the derivation may have taken place. The Vascones, or in other words the ancestors of the modern Basques, were the Spanish tribe which bordered upon Gaul, and it is a reasonable supposition that they called this district the ezpaña, or border. This name would of course be the one familiar to the Gaulish

[1] The only ground for such a notion is the fact that Virgil speaks of the Sicani as an ancient Italian people. But in his day the name Sicani had come to be treated as a mere synonym for Siculi, and as such he uses it. The Greeks carefully distinguished between the two races, the Sikanoi and the Sikeloi.

tribes living north of the Pyrenees, and in course of time may have been used by them to designate the whole country. Bochart's notion that the name of Spain was derived from the Phoenician word *Sapan*, a rabbit, though it was accepted by Niebuhr (Lect. 2. 279), is too trivial for further notice.

As the Vascones were certainly the ancestors of the modern Basques, I shall be pardoned if I pause for a moment to inquire into the origin of a name historically so important. Pliny, when recounting the more remarkable localities in the north of Spain, mentions 'the wood of the Vascones' (4. 34); and as the Basque word *basoa* means a mountain forest, the conjecture which connects the words *basoa* and Vascones is probably a correct one. According to this hypothesis the name of Vascones would signify the foresters; and the Vascones may have been the descendants of the Ibēres, who occupied the more inland parts of the basin of the Ebro, and took refuge in the forest, while their countrymen on the coast were driven to their ships, and fled to Sicily[1].

As to the name Ibēres, some of the Latins (Justin 44. 1; Pliny 3. 4) derived it from Iberus, the Latin name of the Ebro. But to this derivation there are objections both philological and historical. It is not easy to see how the Greek word Ibēr, an Iberian, could be derived from Ibēros, the Ebro, or why the Ibēres came to be named at all after the Iberus, as their expulsion from the neighbourhood of this river is the earliest incident relating to them which history has handed down to us. I can see no reason why the Ebro should have given them a name rather than any other river which they crossed in their journey westward. The practice of deriving names of races from names of rivers prevailed widely among the ancients. Eustathius, in his commentary on Dionysius Perieg. (76), supposes the Ligures to derive their name from the Ligur (Loire), though we have no evidence that the Ligures were ever settled in the basin of that river; and the same mode

[1] See pp. 56–58.

of dealing with these questions led Appian (Mithrid. War) to derive the name of the Bithyni from a river Bithynus. As I never met elsewhere with a river named Bithynus, I think it not impossible that the name was manufactured to support the etymology[1]. We must look in some other direction for the origin of the word Ibēres.

Herodotus (3. 94; 7. 79) locates a people called the Saspeires between the Kolkhoi and Medes; and if these Saspeires be not the Ibēres of later writers, it is difficult to say who they can be. Apollonius Rhodius (2. 397) represents the Sapeires as neighbours of the Kolkhoi; and according to Stephanus Byzantinus the Sapeires were 'a people living in the heart of Pontikē, that is, who are now called Sabeires with a b.' Pontikē, we need hardly observe, means the district of Pontus. Now in Greek we sometimes find an *s* intruding itself under circumstances not very dissimilar to the present; e.g. *hespomai* for *hepomai*, *speos* for *peos*, *smikros* for *mikros*, *skapetos* for *kapetos*, &c. If the second sibilant in Saspeires may be thus accounted for, we may consider Saspeires, Sapeires, and its dialectical variety Sabeires, as merely varied forms of the same word. The Phocaeans first made Iberia known to the Greeks (Herod. 1. 163); and we may infer that the name Ibēres represented the Phocaean pronunciation of the name borne by the nations living around them. The Phocaeans were Ionians, and in the Ionic family of dialects there was a tendency to change the initial *s* into a breathing, and the diphthong *ei* into ē, so that Ibēres may well have been the Phocaean pronunciation of Sabeires. When the form Ibēres was adopted into classical Greek, it seems gradually to have driven the other dialectical forms into disuse, and the ascription of the Phocaean name Ibēres to the Asiatic people, who seem to have been previously known as the

[1] Possibly some stream on the boundary of Bithynia may have been called Bithynus—the Bithynian water—to distinguish it from some stream in the adjoining district; in which case the river would receive its name from the people and not the people from the river.

Sapeires or Saspeires, is strong evidence that their identity with the European Ibēres was generally acknowledged by the later Greeks. The Byzantine historians call the district Ibēria according to classical usage, but its inhabitants they call Sabiri,—in this case giving the initial *s* according to what I presume must have been the custom of the country.

That Strabo (1. 3) should consider the Asiatic Ibēres descendants of the European was a mistake not unlikely to occur. He might be excused for supposing that a small and obscure tribe in Asia were the descendants from, rather than the ancestors of, a people who occupied such a space in history as the Ibēres of Europe. It was no doubt for a similar reason that Eustathius (c. 76; Geog. Min. 4. 16) represented the Asiatic Ligues as descendants of the European.

I have endeavoured to show that Ibēres is merely the Ionic corruption of the more ancient name Saspeires. But there was another name, *Tibarēnoi*, which seems at one time to have been applied to this people, the origin of which must be explained on different principles, and the investigation will require at our hands rather careful criticism.

In the enumeration of the sons of Japheth (Gen. 10. 2) we find the names of 'Tubal and Meshech;' and in Ezekiel (27. 13) 'Tubal and Meshech' are mentioned among those who traded in the markets of Tyre. It would seem, therefore, that the two races so designated retained their ancient names from the time of Moses down to the close of the seventh century B.C.; and as they are on both occasions mentioned together, we may infer that they were during that period neighbouring races. Now in the expedition of Xerxes, B.C. 482, the 'Moskhoi and Tibarēnoi' formed a corps commanded by Ariomardus, son of Darius (Herod. 7. 78); and west of Armenia were the 'Moskhic mountains' (Strabo 11. 12. 4), which we may presume derived their name from the Moskhoi who inhabited them. But Josephus (Ant. 1. 6) tells us that Thobēlos (Tubal) founded

'the Thobaloi, who at the present time are called Ibēres; and the Mosokhēnoi, founded by Mosokhos, have been called Kappadokai. We have however a proof of what was their ancient appellation, for there is even now in their country a city called Mazaka[1], making it clear to those that can understand that the whole people were at one time so denominated.' We must endeavour to reconcile these discrepant statements.

It is probable that the Moskhoi of Herodotus represented that portion of the descendants of Meshech which found a refuge in the 'Moskhic mountains,' when driven from the plains of Cappadocia by stronger races; and the Tibarēnoi that portion of the descendants of Tubal which contrived under similar pressure to retain their ancient name and a kind of rude independence in the northern part of the same mountain district[2]. The Moskhoi who submitted may have formed the subject population of Cappadocia, and the Surioi, whom Herodotus (1. 72) recognized as the 'Kappadokai[3],' may have been the ruling race of the district. In like manner the Tibarēnoi, who yielded to the foreigner, may have taken the name of Saspeires, and we may conjecture that their subjection was originally due to the Kolkhoi, for similar usages seem to have prevailed among the two races. In the expedition of Xerxes the Saspeires were armed like the Kolkhoi (Herod. 7. 79), while the Tibarēnoi still retained the same arms as the Moskhoi. The Tibarēnoi seem to have been recognized as an extant people as late as the time of Strabo (11. 14. 1).

The social habits of a people vary widely with change of time and circumstances; and it would seem almost foolish to look for any similarity in the habits and customs of two

[1] Afterwards Caesareia.

[2] Strabo (11. 3. 3) distinguishes between the peaceful Ibēres of the plain and the warlike tribes of the neighbouring mountains, but he may possibly have had in view the tribes dwelling on the Caucasus rather than those on the Moskhic mountains.

[3] We learn from another passage in Herodotus (7. 72) that the Persians called these Suroi Kappadokai.

races, that had been separated from each other for some 3000 years. But there is a custom, once prevalent among the Tibarēnoi, and still prevalent among the Basques (Quart. Rev. 1868, p. 153), which is so strange that we may be pardoned for calling attention to it. When a Basque woman has borne a child, the father is put to bed, and treated as the woman would be treated in such circumstances in other countries. The custom by the French Basques is called the *couvade*, and is certainly of high antiquity.

Strabo (3. 4. 17, p. 165) speaking of the Spanish women of his day tells us, that 'they work in the fields, and, when they have brought forth, they wait on their husbands, and see them put to bed, instead of themselves.' This extraordinary custom prevailed among the Tibarēnoi of Asia, as we learn from Apoll. Rhodius—

> 'The headland of Genetaian Zeus
> Doubling, they sped along the Tibarenian land.
> There when women bear children to their husbands,
> *These* throw themselves upon the beds, and groan
> With heads bound up, but *they* with victuals wait
> Upon their husbands, and child-bed baths prepare.'
>
> Apoll. Rhod. 2. 1101.

What was the origin of a custom so unnatural it is hard to say, but I think the custom may be quoted in corroboration of other evidence, as showing some connexion between the two races, the Basques and the Tibarēnoi.

Jerome supposes the name Sabeires [Sepharad][1] to be connected with an Assyrian word signifying a border (Obad. 20) and this derivation is not improbably the correct one. The Sabeires inhabited a district which must always have borne the character of a border-land separating the civilized races in the south from the rude nomade races living north of Caucasus. Herodotus occasionally gives a great prominence to the Saspeires. Once (1. 104) he represents the Saspeires as the only people intervening between Kolkhis and Media; and elsewhere (4. 37) he portions out middle Asia among four peoples, the Persians, the Medes, the

[1] See p. 67 below.

Saspeires and the Kolkhoi, numbering them in order from the Persian Gulf northwards. In other places he gives the name a more restricted meaning. Twice he mentions the Saspeires with reference to the polity of the Persian Empire, and in both cases couples them with another people called Alarodioi. As the Persians often substituted an *l* for an *r* Sir Henry Rawlinson suggested that the term Alarodioi might have arisen from a Persian mispronunciation, and that the real name was Ararodioi, that is the men of Ararat.

The scriptural name Ararat is generally translated Armenia in our Authorized Version. It is difficult to fix with precision the locality of these ancient districts, but, judging from the way in which the term Ararat is used in Armenian history, it would seem that Ararat properly indicated the elevated district around Erzroum. The Saspeires may have been the tribes settled immediately south of Caucasus, and the Alarodioi the hills-men who separated them from the districts draining into the Euphrates and the Tigris. Ararat is, no doubt, the Urardi (Urartu) of the Assyrian inscriptions.

The name Urardi or Ararat must have been of extreme antiquity; I suspect it was only a duplicated name Ar-arat signifying the *Ards* or highlands ; for *ard* with this meaning is a word of extreme antiquity and widely known in language. It is probable that the Ararat of Jeremiah (51. 27) was the country round Erzroum; his Ashchenaz, the district to the south-west, and his Minni, the Manai of the Assyrians. This latter province seems to have lain around the lakes Van and Urumiah.

Jeremiah is generally supposed to have prophesied against Babylon about the year 600 B.C.; and, as we have seen, he refers to 'the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashchenaz' as states at that time well known and in some respects formidable. Ashkenaz must have been Celtic, but it has not been settled what races then occupied Ararat and Minni. A considerable number of inscriptions written in the wedge-

shaped character, have been found in modern Armenia, and, according to certain of our Assyriologists, the language of these inscriptions has no affinity with the language now called Armenian. Attempts have been made to trace a connexion between the language of these inscriptions and the Georgian; and the tendency of modern research is to show, that the men of Ararat, with whom the Assyrians warred so frequently, were gradually dispossessed of their land, and succeeded by a people who were the ancestors of the modern Armenians. These, however, are questions which will be discussed at greater length elsewhere. At present we would investigate the condition and political relations of these provinces when subject to the Achaemenian princes as portions of the Persian empire.

In the trilingual inscription at Behistun, Darius enumerates the twenty-three provinces that owned him as sovereign. He starts from certain central districts and gives the names of the neighbouring governments in their order from east to west. Beginning with Persia, he passes to the districts lying immediately west of it on the Euphrates—Susiana, Babylonia, Assyria, and then further westward to Arabia and Egypt and the Maritime Province. Then, selecting as a starting point Saparda, which I take to be the most northerly of his provinces and to range alongside the Caucasus, he joins with it the province lying westward of it, viz. Yuna. Starting then from Media[1] as a central point, he proceeds as before westward, and joins with it Armenia and Cappadocia. Having thus exhausted the number of his western satrapies, he turns to the eastern portion of h s great empire.

In other inscriptions Darius gives us the names of other provinces, and ranges those already mentioned in a somewhat different order, but in all the inscriptions we find Cappadocia following Armenia, and Yuna following Saparda; and the names of these four satrapies always come together.

Sir H. Rawlinson, to whom we owe the decipherment of

[1] Media was generally considered the central point of Asia. Polyb. 5. 44.

the Behistun inscription, renders Yuna by Ionia and leaves Saparda untranslated. I would rather consider Yuna to be that general name for the Greek race and country so widely diffused throughout the East—in short the scriptural Javan and the Sanscrit Yavan-ah. This Persian satrapy probably extended over the greater part of Asia Minor, and perhaps over the whole of that country west of the Halys; and it may have received the name of Yuna from containing so many Greek colonies—Ionian and Aeolian.

In like manner Saparda may have contained within it several different races. Herodotus must have been thinking of the satrapy rather than of any particular people, when he represented the Saspeires as reaching from Kolkhis to Media, and also when he portioned out Middle Asia among four races—Persians, Medes, Saspeires, and Kolkhoi. It would seem from the Behistun inscription that Darius did not regard Kolkhis as forming one of the main divisions of his empire.

It may be thought an objection to this theory that the sketch I have given of the Persian satrapies differs so widely from that which is found in Herodotus (3. 90–94). But Herodotus probably wrote his history some sixty or seventy years after Darius set up his inscription, and the provincial governments of Persia seem to have been just as liable to change as those of the Roman, and to have been altered with as little regard to the nationality of the subject races—in short, just as political or economic considerations made a new arrangement convenient. According to Herodotus the first, second, and third satrapies must have comprised the whole of Asia Minor west of the Halys, together with the district of the 'Suroi' east of that river; the fourth satrapy, Cilicia; and the fifth, Syria, Cyprus, &c. Armenia formed the thirteenth satrapy, the Matieni, 'Saspeires' and Alarodians the eighteenth, and the Moskhoi Tibarēnoi, Makrones, Mosunoikoi, and Mares, the nineteenth. It is probable that so much of the three first satrapies as lay west of the Halys made up the Yuna of

Darius, that the fourth and fifth were his 'maritime province,' that the thirteenth and eighteenth were respectively his Armenia and Saparda, and the nineteenth his Cappadocia.

I have argued that the Saparda of the inscriptions must have been the district lying immediately south of Caucasus, partly from the place it occupies in the list of satrapies, and partly from its apparent connexion with the name Sapeires. But there is another circumstance which points to the same conclusion. A Jewish prophet, who flourished one or two generations before Darius, speaks of the captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad (Obad. 20). Now Jerome's Hebrew instructor rendered Sepharad by the word 'Bosphorus,' and the eastern shores of the Cimmerian Bosphorus were in Saparda. The Targum of Jonathan translates 'in Spain,' and the modern Jews have adopted the notion that Sepharad was the ancient name of Spain, and consequently call the Spanish branch of their nation the Sephardim. The mistake arose from a blunder, which was just as common among the Greeks as among the Jews, I mean a confounding of the two Iberias, the European and the Asiatic. That the great military monarchies did occasionally transport the conquered races to the neighbourhood of the Asiatic Iberia appears from the fact that the Syrians of Damascus were carried away to Kir (Amos 1. 5), which is now generally taken to be the district drained by the Cyrus; that is, the country which, according to our hypothesis, formed a part of the Saparda satrapy.

There is reason to believe that some portion of Sepharad was called Casiphia. It was to a place called Casiphia that Ezra (8. 17) sent for Levites to accompany the Jews he was leading homewards from the land of their captivity. Now, according to Eratosthenes (Strabo 11. 2. 15), the Kaukasos was called by the natives Kaspios, a name which may have been derived from the root *kasaph*, to be white, and the name Kaspios may have signified the white or snowy mountains. Kaspi-os seems to be nothing more than

Casiphia in a Greek dress. From it the neighbouring tribes must have derived their name of Caspii, and the adjacent sea its name of Caspian.

The people living in the eastern parts of Caucasus were called by the Latin historians Albani; and in the same district we find in mediaeval times a people called the Aghovans. As the change of *l* to *gh* is a well-known letter-change in Armenian, there can be little doubt that the name Aghovans represents the classical name Albani. The Aghovans were at one time an important people and fill a considerable space in ecclesiastical history, though there is now hardly a vestige of them remaining in their old seats. There is some authority for saying that large numbers of them were transported to Kandahar by Nadir Shah, Timoor, and other conquerors; and that consequently the tradition which makes them the same people as the modern Afghans may not be without foundation. The Afghans are one of the races which speculation has fixed upon as the descendants of the ten tribes. They may not have any pure Jewish blood in their veins, but they were not improbably one of the peoples among whom 'the Dispersion' settled.

We have hitherto used the word Ibēres to denote a people supposed to be connected with the Basques. Such was not the meaning generally given to the word by the contemporaries of Diodorus, Strabo, and Appian. In the passages we have quoted from these authors they were evidently using the language of books; when employing the current language of their day they gave the word a wider signification. The name Ibēres came gradually to signify the whole population of Spain without distinction of race, just as the name of Britons came to be applied to the whole population of our island, including alike the conquered Celts and their English conquerors. Diodorus (5. 34) includes among the Ibēres the Lusitanoi, whose Celtic origin cannot be doubted; and Strabo not only the Lusitanoi (3. 3, p. 152), but also the Tourdetanoi (3. 1, p. 139). Strabo indeed mentions also a people called

Keltikoi, but it could not be his intention to distinguish them ethnologically from the Tourdetanoi and the other races to which he gives the name of Ibēres, for he quotes Polybius to show that the Keltikoi were *akin* to the Tourdetanoi (3. 2, p. 151). The Keltikoi were probably those tribes who lived furthest from the Phoenician settlements, and received the benefits of Phoenician civilization at a later period than their kinsmen the Tourdetanoi, who were early distinguished from the other Spanish tribes by their superior civilization and refinement.

The Celtibēres, that vigorous race which from an early period made its influence felt in every corner of the Peninsula, may be considered as the principal source whence the modern Spaniards derive their origin. The name itself imports a mixed people, half Celts half Ibēres. Their proper seats appear to have been the high table land of the interior; and the term Celtiberia may have originated either in a subjection of Ibēres to Celts, or of Celts to Ibēres. Niebuhr adopted the latter hypothesis, for no reason that I am aware of, unless it be that it is opposed to the general current of ancient authority. The classical historians without exception represent the Celts as the aggressors and the victors in the struggle. Strabo (3. 4, p. 162) speaks of the Keltic expedition as if it were a well-known historical fact: 'North of the Keltibēres dwell the Bērōnes, conterminous with the Cantabri Conisci, who themselves sprang from the Keltic expedition;' and elsewhere in the same chapter (3. 4, p. 158) he tells us that if the Ibēres had been willing to band together it would have been impossible either for the Carthaginians to invade 'and subdue the larger part of them by their greater strength, or at an earlier period for the Tyrians, or afterwards for the Keltoi, who are now called the Keltibēres and Bērōnes.' Strabo appears to have looked upon the Tyrians as the first people that gained an ascendancy[1] in

[1] When speaking of the order in which these races *settled* in the Peninsula, Appian places the Keltoi before the Tyrians, and no doubt correctly.

the Peninsula, after them the Keltoi, and lastly the Carthaginians. The date of the Tyrian ascendancy will be discussed elsewhere; that of the Keltoi in all probability did not long precede that of the Carthaginians, which began in the latter half of the third century B.C. The army which Hamilcar carried into Sicily in the year 480, B.C., consisted of Phoinikes, Libues, Ibēres, Ligues, Elisukoi, Sardonioi, and Kurnioi (Herod. 7. 165). The two first of these races were African, the two last came from Sardinia and Corsica. Herodotus evidently counted the different races as they dwelt from south to north, and then turned aside to the two islands. He passes from Africa to the Ibēres on the opposite coast of Spain, then to the Ligues in the basin of the Ebro, and then to the Elisukoi on the other side of the Pyrenees. This view is in agreement with the account which Scylax gives us in his Periplus. Beginning at Cadiz he sailed seven days along the coast of the Ibēres, then two days and a night along the coasts of the Ligues and the mixed Ibēres, till he came to the Rhone. He seems to have looked upon the Elisukoi as one of these mixed races. Neither in the historian nor in the geographer do we find any mention of the Celtibēres; and I think we may infer that in the fifth century B.C., they had not as yet established themselves on the eastern coast of the Peninsula. Polybius (3. 17) informs us that in his day Saguntum separated Iberia from Celtiberia, whence we may infer that during the little more than two centuries which elapsed between the expedition of Hamilcar and the establishment of the Carthaginian power in Spain, the Celtibēres had pushed their conquests to the Mediterranean, and subjected the Ibēres that dwelt between the Ebro and the mountains near Saguntum.

The Keltoi were no doubt settled in the west of Spain many centuries before they worked their way to the eastern coasts; and when we remember how remote must have been the date of their first immigration, we cannot be surprised at the vagueness of the notices relating to this

event that are met with in the classical writers. Diodorus (5. 33) merely tells us that the Ibēres and the Keltoi, after a war for the possession of the land, agreed to a joint occupation, intermarried, and were from this circumstance called Celtibēres. Appian says (De Reb. Hisp. 2): 'It is not my intention to inquire who are supposed to have first settled it (i.e. Iberia), or who held it after them, as I am only writing of Roman affairs. But I may remark that the Keltoi appear to me at some time or other to have passed over the Purēnē and dwelt in the land jointly with them (i. e. the Ibēres), whence came also the name Keltibēres. The Phoenicians also seem to me to have settled certain portions of Iberia,' &c. We may infer that in the opinion of Appian the *settlements*[1] of the Keltoi in Spain preceded those of the Phoenicians. Lucan, himself a Spaniard, represents the Celts, who contributed to form the composite race called the Celtiberi as coming from abroad, 'fugitives from the old race of the Galli' (4. 9). The phrase 'the old race of the Galli' seems to have been used by the Roman antiquaries with a very definite meaning, as we shall see in the next chapter. In their use of it, the phrase generally denoted the Celtic tribes who were settled in Italy *before* the Cisalpine Gauls invaded it. With these earlier Celts, the Spanish Celts were in all probability connected.

If the Spanish Celts were Ligurian in origin we may form a reasonable hypothesis as to the nature of their immigration into Spain, and as to their action on the Iberic race that preceded them. We may suppose that the proper Ibēres, or in other words the Basques, entered Spain by the passes of the eastern Pyrenees, through which at a later date must have followed the Ligures mentioned by Thucydides (6. 2); but the main body of the Ligures seem to have

[1] When speaking of the tribes who gained an *ascendancy* in the Peninsula, Strabo ranges them in the order,—the Tyrians, the Keltoi, and the Carthaginians. Appian is speaking of the order of their *settlement*, and so places the Keltoi before the Carthaginians.

settled in the south of Gaul, or to have passed through it in their journey westward. They certainly did not enter Spain by the western Pyrenees, as some modern writers suppose, for Basques still occupy the district, and most certainly no trace of this people would have lingered there if the tide of Celtic immigration had flowed over it. The Celts appear to have reached the west of Spain in the way generally followed in those early migrations (Tac. Germ. 2), viz. on board their ships; and we need have little hesitation in fixing on the mouth of the Tagus as the spot to which for the most part they directed their course. Its central position, its readiness of access, and its lying in the country of the Lusitani, the most conspicuous of the Celtic tribes, are all of them circumstances that favour this conclusion.

According to Pliny (3. 3) the Celtici were a tribe of Turdetani, and came from Lusitania; and according to Strabo (3. 3, p. 153), the Keltikoi on the north-west coast sprang from those on the Anas, and had marched northwards with the Tourduli, a people that must have been akin to and in origin probably identical with the Tourdetani. Everything tends to show that the Spanish Celts spread themselves from the Tagus and its neighbourhood.

A people like the Celtibēres, partly Basque and partly Celtic, were also to be found north of the Pyrenees. Scylax, as we have seen, calls the people on the coast west of the Rhone 'the mixed Ibēres,' and in his day the term Ibēres must have retained its original meaning and denoted a race of Basque origin. This mixed people probably occupied the whole of the district between the two 'Gallitic Gulfs[1],' though in proceeding westward the Iberic element may have become gradually weaker, till on the coast of the Atlantic there may have been a people almost purely Celtic. It would seem that in a later age, this mixed

[1] The Gallitic [Galatic] gulfs were our modern Gulf of Lyons and the Bay of Biscay.

people, or rather that portion of them which survived the political changes they passed through, were called the Aquitani.

Strabo expressly says (4. 1. 1) that the Akuitanoi were different from the other two races of Gaul, the Belgai and the Keltai[1], 'not only in language but also in their persons, agreeing rather with the Ibēres than with the Galatai.' Elsewhere (4. 2) he repeats the statement in slightly varying language, so that he must have been strongly impressed with the differences said to exist between the Aquitani and the Celtic races whom he calls the Galatai. There can be little doubt that in these statements Strabo used the term Ibēres to signify the Spaniards generally, or, in other words, the Celtiberian population which had then impressed their character on the country.

There are now some 800,000 people who speak the Basque language, and of these about 150,000 live on the French side of the Pyrenees. Our countrymen generally consider these French Basques to be the descendants of the ancient Aquitani, and this latter people to have been Ibēres proper. As the question is one of much historical interest, and as great diversity of opinion exists respecting it, we shall not be throwing time away if we examine it with some attention.

Shortly before the sixth century the country between the Pyrenees and the Garonne was known by the name of Novem-populania; in the course of that century it lost the name, and was styled Vasconia. The circumstances that led to this change of name appear to have been the following. During the fifth century the Visigoths made several expeditions into Spain, and in 467 they took Pampeluna and Saragossa, chief cities of the Spanish Vascones, and cruelly ravaged their country. Desolating inroads on the part of the mountaineers and expeditions into the Basque territory on the part of the Visigoths are

[1] Strabo's use of the word Keltai instead of Keltoi shows that he was copying from some Latin author.

the principal events in the history of the following century. The Franks, when they had conquered the Visigoths, continued these expeditions against the Basques, and in 581 one of the Frankish leaders, a duke of Bordeaux, was defeated by them with great loss. In the year 587, as Gregory of Tours informs us, the Basques invaded La Basse Navarre in force, and to this invasion French and Spanish antiquaries generally attribute the Basque settlement north of the Pyrenees.

Several circumstances tend to show us that this conclusion is in the main a correct one. The monkish historians give to the French Basques the name of Vascones, a name which in the classical times was never borne save by the Spanish tribe living immediately south of the Pyrenees. At the present day the French Basques have no sympathy with the 'Gascons,' or French-speaking race in their neighbourhood; they represent themselves as being akin to their Spanish namesakes, and, like them, call themselves Euscaldunac, or the men who speak Euscara. Their intrusion into Gaul resembled in almost all its particulars that of the Bretons, and seems to have taken place about the same period.

The writer who has most strenuously opposed these views is Fauriel[1]. His arguments, though detailed at great length, may be briefly summarized. Many names of places on the northern slope of the Pyrenees, far away from the present Basque district, are names of Basque origin, but as no one denies that the Aquitani were a mixed people partly descended from Ibēres, the occurrence of these Basque names need not surprise us. The Aquitani, like the kindred race of the Celtibēres, became Romanized, and in the fifth century appear to have been distinguished above the other Gaulish tribes by their superior refinement (Sulp. Sev. I. 20). They must have borne to the Vascones of that period much the same relation as the Spaniards bore to these rude mountaineers, and were probably as little aware of the

[1] Gaule Meridionale, 2. 340.

blood-relationship that existed between them. Fauriel quotes Ravennas to show that a Gothic writer named Athanavide called Aquitania Vasconia, and that another writer named Eldebald mentions both Vasconia and Spano-Vasconia. But these names may have easily established themselves in Gothic usage before the time of Ravennas, for he is generally supposed to have lived in the seventh century. Fauriel also refers to an unpublished MS. written at a time 'ou *il y a apparence* que la Burgundie formait encore un royaume indépendant des Franks, par conséquent avant l'année 534,' which speaking of the valleys of the Gave and the Adour now inhabited by French Basques, tells us 'Vascones incolunt terram per diversa vallium.' But, even if we could trust the supposed date of the MS., this statement would have little bearing on the question. For ages before the great inroad of 587 the Basques had been desolating Novem-populania, and from the crests of the Pyrenees would naturally drive their herds to pasture in the districts they had wasted. After the year 587 this partial occupation of the country may have been converted into a permanent settlement. The Bretons had been flying into Armorica in detached bodies long before the immigration recorded under the date which seems to have laid the foundation of modern Brittany. As the name of Brittany was extended to districts beyond those which the Bretons occupied, so the name of Gascony indicated an area much larger than that actually occupied by the intrusive Vascones.

We have been led to the conclusion that the Ibēres at one time occupied the whole line of coast from the Rhone westward to the neighbourhood of Cadiz. How far they penetrated inland it is difficult to say. Both physiology and philology have been appealed to on the question. A few years back an English officer was exploring the graves in the caves at Gibraltar, and found numerous skeletons which appeared to have been deposited there in ancient times and exhibited striking peculiarities of structure. The

skulls were unusually thick, and decidedly 'dolicho-cephalic,' and the muscular impressions were strongly marked. The thigh bones were keeled or ridged, and the shin bones flattened at the sides, so as to exhibit an acute edge both in front and behind. It is said the same peculiarities are to be found in the skeletons lying in Basque graveyards, and in the 'dolmens' of Andalusia, and it has been inferred that the Basque race must at one time have been spread widely over the Peninsula. Before this conclusion be admitted, it must be shown, first, that the same peculiarities do not occur, or occur very rarely, in other races of men; and, secondly, that they prevail so generally among the Basques as to be fairly treated as a mark of race. Professional men of whom I have made inquiry answer both these questions doubtfully. If such peculiarities really distinguish the Basque people, it will be interesting to know whether the same distinguishing marks are to be found among the people of Georgia.

The philological considerations supposed to bear upon the question have been imported into the discussion, chiefly if not exclusively, from W. Humboldt's work 'Urbewohner Hispaniens.' He is represented by some writers as having virtually settled the question, and proved that the whole of the Peninsula was once settled by Iberic tribes. I believe few works so often referred to have been so little read. Humboldt's work *proves* nothing; it contains little else but speculation; a heap of guesses, some plausible, many questionable, and not a few clear and obvious blunders. The German scholar deserved credit for bringing under critical notice the works of Astarloa and Larramendi; but we see clearly enough that his knowledge of the language was not very profound, and though his scholarlike instinct prevented him from following his guides in many of their flights, he too often makes their speculations the starting points of his own. I have seldom read a work of equal pretension from which I learnt so little.

It cannot be denied that Basque philology may occasionally throw light on Iberic history, but it requires careful handling to make etymology a safe ground for historical inference. The town Graccuris was founded by and named after Sempronius Gracchus, and it lay in a district of the Vascones which is at this day occupied by their descendants the modern Basques. We may venture to divide the name thus, Gracc-uris; and if we suppose *uris* to be the Latinized form of the Basque word *uria*, a town, then Graccuris would signify the town of Gracchus. But whether this etymology be true or not, it is pretty certain that the name is a Basque compound, and Graccuris an Iberic town. We may also with considerable confidence assert as much of the neighbouring town Calaguris, though we are altogether at sea with respect to its etymology. Now a place called Calaguris occurs in Aquitania, not many miles south of Toulouse; and on the strength of the name I think we may infer, that at one time there were Ibēres settled in that neighbourhood; and it is important to be able to fix upon any locality in Aquitania as distinctly Iberic. There are not many other examples which I could submit to a critical reader with as well grounded an assurance of their being accepted.

When the Romans established their dominion in Spain, a mixed language, the Celtiberian, seems to have been in general use, though in certain localities dialects purely Celtic, or purely Iberic, continued to be spoken. What were the peculiar characteristics of the Celtiberian it is difficult to say, owing to the few specimens of the language that have come down to us, but it is probable that it was largely made up of Celtic. The Phoenician settlements in the south and east of the Peninsula must have weakened the influence of the Iberic dialects there spoken, long before the Celtibēres worked their way to the Mediterranean. The country running along the southern front of the Pyrenees was no doubt then, as at present, the stronghold of Basque customs and the Basque language; and

when Strabo (3. 3) distinguishes the Ibēres from the Astures and the Celtibēres, he probably applied the term Ibēres to a Basque-speaking people, while by Astures he indicated a Celtic race, and by Celtibēres the mixed race speaking Celtiberian. The whole people now speaking Basque must be less than a million in number, and it may be doubted if they were much more numerous at the time in question.

CHAPTER III.

The Ligures the same people as the Ligues of Greek history; Ligues settled in Asia Minor, south of Colchis; Ligures settled in the north of Italy; their extension westward along the coasts of the Mediterranean. — Ligues in the basin of the Ebro; Ligues in Baetica near Cadiz; Spain called by Eratosthenes the Liguan foreland; Hesiod seems to have used the term Ligues as a general name for the Celtic race. — The outlying races of the world Aithiopes, Indoi, Skuthai, Kelto-Skuthai, &c.; mistakes that have arisen from not sufficiently attending to the significance of the terms Kelto-Skuthai, Galato-Skuthai, &c. — Ambrones, the name of one of the races that accompanied the Cimbri in their invasion of Italy, 113 B.C.; the name recognized by the Italian Ligures as that of their own race; a people named Ambrones settled north of the Carpathians; the names Ambron, Umbri, &c., not unknown in Celtic districts in Asia. — Aedui Ambarri one of the Celtic tribes that crossed the Alps in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus; claimed kindred with certain of the Ligures of Italy; considered by some writers to be akin to the Umbri. — Races settled in central Italy after the expulsion of the Siculi. — Greek writers of the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. seem to have looked on Italy as mainly occupied by three native races,—the Oinōtroi, the Opikoi, and the Ombrikoi. — The Oinōtroi the early Greek settlers of southern Italy. — The Opikoi the same people as the Osci of Latin history; origin of the name; Oscan dialects more or less spoken both in central and in southern Italy; Sabines, Samnites, the 'Aborigines,' and the Latins all Oscan races. — The Ombrikoi the same people as the Umbri of the Latins; according to Herodotus occupied the whole of northern Italy; descended from the 'Old Galli'; akin to, if not identical with, the Ligures. — The Rasenu and later Tyrrheni. — The Ligurian races penetrated into Europe by way of the Danube; origin of the names Umbri, Ambrones, &c.; Veneti, the last of the Ligurian races that reached Italy; expelled a Greek people called the Euganei. — Geography of the Euxine and its neighbourhood; the Danube, the Borysthenes, and the Phasis. — Dates of the several Ligurian migrations up the Danube.

The name of Ibēres is found mixed up with that of a people whom the Romans called the Ligures, and the Greeks, according to a well-known letter-change, the Ligues. The fortunes of the two races have been strangely blended for

more than 3000 years, though they appear to have been from the first aliens to each other in blood and language.

According to Herodotus (7. 72) there were Ligues in the army of Xerxes. They were armed like the Paphlagonians, who, according to Josephus (Ant. I. 6), were descended from Gomer, and known by the name of Riphath. Perhaps we should not be altogether justified in concluding from this circumstance that the Ligues were akin to the Paphlagonians, but we may safely infer that they were subjected to the same social and political influences, and probably located in the same neighbourhood.

In his commentary on Dionysius Periegetes (76), Eustathius intimates that some of the Kolkhian Ligues were descendants[1] of the European tribe of that name, and he tells us 'Lycophron shows this when he gives us the history of Kutaia, a Ligurian town among the Kolkhoi.' I think we may gather that in the opinion of these Greek antiquaries the Asiatic Ligues were settled in some district intermediate between the Paphlagones and the Kolkhoi; and the same causes which drove the Iberes[2] to seek a new home west of the Euxine may, though probably at a somewhat later period, have driven thither also a portion of the Ligues.

Roman history generally represents the Ligures as settled in the mountainous country which fills the north-west corner of Italy. But at an earlier period they were to be traced much further westward. The Greeks gave the name of Ligues to the tribe of the Salues who dwelt round Marseilles, and called the country Ligustikē, or the Ligurian country (Str. 4); and many a battle with the 'Ligures' had to be fought before the safety of the infant colony was secured. According to Stephanus Byzantinus, Hecataeus made the 'Elisukoi,' a race of Ligues, and Avienus (Ora

[1] The custom of deriving Asiatic races from the more celebrated races bearing the same name in Europe was common among the later Greek historians. Strabo is notorious for his blunders in this respect.

[2] Chap. II. p. 56.

Maritima, 585) locates the 'Elisykes' round Narbonne, and describes them as the earliest inhabitants of the district. The Bebrukes, whom Dio Cassius (Frag. Vales. 6) fixes near Narbonne, and who are mentioned in the poem ascribed to Scymnus of Chios[1] as settled between the Spaniards and the Greeks of Marseilles, may have been a tribe of Elisukoi, or perhaps that people under another name.

Scylax commences his coast-survey at the Straits, and passes thence eastward along the coasts of Spain. He tells us—'After the Ibēres follow the Ligues and the mixed Ibēres, as far as the river Rhone. The coasting from the Liguan Emporion to the Rhone takes two days and one night.' The Ligues here mentioned must have been the people who, according to Thucydides (6. 2), drove the Ibēres from the river Sikanos; and Emporion, which lay a little north of the modern Barcelona, must have taken from them the name of Liguan. The 'mixed Ibēres,' who dwelt further eastward, were in all probability subject to the Ligues among whom they lived; and we may conjecture that this latter people gained their ascendancy in these districts when others of their countrymen turned the eastern extremity of the Pyrenees, and drove the Ibēres from the Sikanos, that is, as we have shown elsewhere[2], from the basin of the Ebro. The small tribes, which in the time of Strabo (4. 1. 12, p. 186) were mingled with the Volcae Arecomisci, must have been the remains of the ancient tribes displaced by the intrusive Volcae; in other words, remains of the Ligues and the Ibēres of whom we are now speaking.

If from the basin of the Ebro we pass to the opposite corner of the Peninsula, we there also find traces of Ligurian occupation. Stephanus Byzantinus has the entry, 'Ligustinē: a city of the Ligues, bordering on Western Ibēria, and in the neighbourhood of Tartessos[3]. The inhabitants

[1] v. 201 Geogr. Min. 1. p. 204. [2] Vide Chap. II. p. 57.

[3] The received text has Tarsos, but scholars are generally agreed that we should read Tartessos.

are called Ligues.' Tartessos was a Tyrian colony near Cadiz. The men of Cadiz, and no doubt of Tartessos also, retained their Tyrian manners and customs as late as Strabo's time (3. 5. 8, p. 173). The territory belonging to Tartessos lay at the mouth of the Baetis (Guadalquivir), and in the immediate neighbourhood were the Turdetani, a people certainly of Celtic origin, and to the south-west were the Bastitani, a mongrel race, half Ibēres, and half Tyrian. I believe the people whom Stephanus Byzantinus calls the 'Ligues' were a portion of the Turdetani. If the Spanish Celts were of Ligurian origin, Ligustinē, or the Ligurian town, would be the name which the Greek trader would naturally give to the first Celtic town he came to after passing the Tyrian frontier. The language of Festus Avienus (Ora Mar. 284) is consistent with this view; for he represents the Tartessus—such was the ancient name of the Baetis—as flowing from the Ligurian lake (ex Ligustico lacu), which must have been some lake in the country of the Turdetani.

There can, I think, be little doubt that the district immediately east of Tartessus was recognized as Ligurian territory no less than the basin of the Ebro; and we may conclude that in both these localities the population was mainly, if not wholly, Ligurian. In the greater part of the Peninsula there was a mixed people, half Celts, half Ibēres, but there are many reasons which tend to show that in the whole of the Peninsula the Celts were the predominant race.

The wide extension of the Ligues westward is in agreement with the language of Eratosthenes. According to Strabo (2. 1. 40, p. 92) this old geographer taught that there were three forelands projecting from the north—the Peloponnesian, the Italian, and the Ligurian—between the first and second of which lay the Adriatic, and between the second and third the Tyrrhenian Sea. When we remember the high reputation and the real merits of Eratosthenes, it is astonishing how little attention has been

drawn to the fact that he calls the Spanish peninsula the Ligurian. His use of the term is to me inexplicable, except on the hypothesis that he considered the Celts, who occupied the greater part of the Peninsula, to be of Ligurian origin. If we accept this hypothesis, the Ligues of Thucydides, who drove the Ibēres from the Sikanos, or in other words, from the basin of the Ebro, were merely one of those waves of Celtic immigration which poured into the Peninsula. That these Ligues *were* Celts is probable, among other reasons, from the topography of their district. The country at the southern foot of the Eastern Pyrenees, and the district lying between the Sikanos, or Sichoris[1], and the sea, was inhabited by the Jaccetani, Oretani, Laletani, Cosetani, &c., races which there is reason to believe were of Celtic origin. The termination *tani* points in this direction; and in the marches separating the Jaccetani from the Vascones, who are the acknowledged ancestors of the modern Basques, we find a town called Forum Gallorum. It would be difficult to account for this name, except on the hypothesis that the Jaccetani, in whose territory the city lay, were a Celtic, or as the *later* Romans would have called them, a Gallic people, and that they bordered on some alien race. The hypothesis we have stated is confirmed by Appian. He tells us in his book on the Spanish wars, that 'the Keltoi, who are now called Galatai and Galloi, inhabit that portion of it (i.e. the range of the Pyrenees) which lies towards the sunrising, and the Ibēres and Celtiberes the portion towards the sunset;' in other words, that Celts inhabited the eastern, and Vascones and Celtiberic tribes the western, Pyrenees. The change of the Iberic name Sicanus into Sichoris seems also to be in agreement with this hypothesis. The Spanish and Portuguese are Romance languages, modified by the Celtic dialects they supplanted; and one of their most characteristic features is the frequent

[1] Vide Chap. II. p. 57.

change of *n* to *r*: thus the Latin nomen, a name, becomes the Spanish *nombre*; lumen, light, becomes *lumbre*; homo homin-, man, is *hombre*; sanguis, sanguin-is, blood, *sangre*, &c.; and for sanare, to heal, the Portuguese has *sarar*. Assuming, what is in itself probable, that this law of letter-change was derived from the old Celtic dialects of the Peninsula, the name Sicanus would, in the language of the intrusive Ligures, be converted into Sichoris.

There are some grounds for supposing that Hesiod used the name of Ligues as a general name for the Celtic race. Strabo (7. 3. 7) preserves a line of his, which, though I cannot parse, I venture to translate, for the meaning is clear enough:—

'Aithiopas te Ligusti de Skuthas Hippēmolgous'

The Æthiops and the Ligues and the mare-milking Skuthai[1].

Ephorus (Strabo 1. 2. 28, p. 34) divided the outlying portions of the world into four parts, assigning the East to the Indoi, the South to the Aithiopes, the West to the Keltoi, and the North to the Skuthai. It is a reasonable conjecture that Hesiod when he wrote the verse above quoted had in his mind three of these great divisions, and that his Ligues answered to the Keltoi of Ephorus.

According to some writers, the earliest inhabitants of Latium were Ligues (Dionys. Halic. 1. 10); and the Sicilian historian Philistus, who flourished in the fourth century B.C., tells us that the Siculi were Ligues expelled by the Umbri and Aborigines (Dionys. 1. 22). Perhaps the best mode of explaining the use of the phrase Ligues in the passages here referred to, is by supposing that it was used loosely as a general name for the Celtic race.

The origin of the name Ligues I am unable to explain. Aithiopes, as I understand the word, means the black-faces; and the term must have been used by Ephorus to indicate the black races of Africa. His Indoi were, no doubt, the

[1] The verse is evidently blundered. Heyne, Kramer, and also Didot's editor, have tried their hands at correction, but not very happily. I do not wish to add to the list of failures, and therefore shall not follow their example.

men of the Indus, in other words the Sanscrit-speaking race inhabiting the Punjaub. He appears to have clearly distinguished between the Keltoi of the West and the Skuthai of the North of Europe. The name Skuthai was however long used as a mere appellative. Strabo gives this name to the 'Sarmatai' (II. 2. 1, p. 492), and to the Lēgai (II. 5. 1, p. 503), that is, to the ancestors of the modern Lesghi, while Ptolemy (3. 5) calls the Alaunoi Skuthai. The origin of the name is not, I think, far to seek. The Irish word *scuite* means a wanderer, and this name was probably given by the Celtic tribes of the Euxine to the wandering races around them, and so passed to the Greek colonists in their neighbourhood. It was in its character of an appellative that Skuthai enters into the compound Kelto-Skuthai. Plutarch (Marius 11) employs this phrase to designate the Kimbric migration, which passed from the 'Pontic Scythia' to the Western Ocean. Strabo tells us (I. 2. 27, p. 33) that the Greeks at first called all the northern races 'Skuthai or Nomades,' but afterwards distinguished them as Keltoi, Ibēres, Kelto-Skuthai, &c. His use of the last term has led to much wild speculation; and some modern writers, on the strength of this phrase, have located Skuthai even in Spain[1].

When the Cimbri and Teutones were preparing to invade Italy, 113 B.C., one division, the Cimbri, took the route by Noricum, the other, consisting of the Teutones and Ambrones, advanced through Liguria (Plut. Mar. 15). The latter army was opposed by Marius; and his first engagement with the invaders near Aquae Sextiae was fought with 'the most warlike portion of the enemy, by whom the Romans under Manlius and Caepio had been defeated previously; they were called Ambrones, and the number of

[1] There is no authority in classical literature for saying that the Skuthai proper were ever settled in the west of Europe. The Scythian promontory referred to by Mela (3. c. 1) ('Deinde ad septentriones toto latere terra convertitur a Celtico promontorio ad Scythicum promontorium') did not project in the Western Ocean, but according to *his* geography in the Northern or Arctic Sea.

these alone was over 30,000' (Plut. Mar. 19). Though taken unprepared after a carousal, they entered into the fight in military order, and 'striking their weapons in unison, and all leaping simultaneously, shouted out repeatedly their name Ambrones, either to excite themselves, or to alarm their enemy[1] by proclaiming it. When the Ligues, who were the first of the Italian troops that attacked them, heard them shouting, and understood what was said, they themselves cried out in answer, that it was their own name, for the Ligues so call themselves throughout their tribes. The shouting therefore to and fro was frequent and reciprocal before they came to hand-to-hand conflict,' &c. (Ib. 19). It seems, therefore, first, that Ambrones was an old national name of the Ligures, and secondly, that one portion of the invading army was a Ligurian people.

Whence came the Ligurian people who thus joined in the invasion of Italy we are not told. But it seems probable that their native seats lay north of the Alps, and that they joined the invaders when they first penetrated into that district, 113 B.C. Strabo tells us (7. 3. 2) that Celtic tribes were mixed with the Thracian—'Boioi and Skordiskoi and Tauriskoi, but some call the Skordiskoi Skordistai, and speak of the Tauriskoi as the *Liguriskoi* and Tauristai[2].' It would seem, therefore, according to these authorities, that the Tauriskoi were a Ligurian people; and this is in agreement with the mythus preserved by Ammianus Marcellinus (15. 9. 9), according to which, Hercules delivered Spain from Geryon, and Gaul from Tauriscus. The slaughter of Geryon, and the abduction of his oxen from the neighbourhood of Cadiz, was one of the labours imposed upon Hercules; and as he returned homewards he had to fight on the stony plain near the mouth of the Rhone with a people, whom Aeschylus calls the Ligues.

[1] Compare what Livy says about the Galatai of Asia; Hist. lib. xxxviii. c. 17.

[2] Macrobius was probably referring to this people when he stated (Saturn. I. 18), on the authority of Aristotle, that there was a temple to Bacchus among 'the Ligyrei in Thrace.'

(Prom. Solutus, quoted by Strabo 4. 1. 7). These Ligues I take to be the people symbolized by the Tauriscus, who figures in the mythus alluded to.

From the Taurisci of Noricum may have proceeded both the Ambrones who fought with Marius, and the Ombrones (Ptolemy 3. 5) who appear to have been settled north of the Carpathians, near the sources of the Vistula, and who, according to some scholars[1], were of the same stock as the Umbri.

As we have reason to believe that the term Ambrones was a national name for all the Ligurian tribes, it is matter of no little interest to ascertain if there be any trace of the name in the district from which, as it would appear, the Ligues must have come. Now a large portion of the southern coast of the Euxine was occupied by the Celtic Paphlagones, the Riphath of Josephus. The principal Greek town in the district was the Milesian colony of Sinope; and in its neighbourhood a body of the Cimmerii settled after their incursion into Asia Minor (Herod. 4. 12). The legends connected with the early history of Sinope, and the revolutions through which it passed, were collected by Scymnus of Chios (Fragm. 205):

> 'But Sinope was named after one
> Of the Amazons, near to whom was the country
> Which formerly the highly-descended Suroi dwelt in;
> Afterwards came, as they say, such of the Greeks
> As made an attack on the Amazons, Autolycus and
> Phlogeus with Deleon—men of Thessaly;
> Then Ambron by descent a Milesian—
> He seems to have been made away with by the Kimmerioi;
> After the Kimmerioi Kōos, and again Kritinēs,
> Who were exiles of the Milēsioi—
> These together peopled it, what time
> The army of the Kimmerioi Asia overran.'

It is instructive to note the way in which Greek antiquaries deal with these ancient legends. Tzetzes (Chil. 13. v. 136) explains the name of Kōos, by supposing that it was the ancient name of the city, which he identifies with the Kasos of Homer. Eustathius, in his commentary on Dion.

[1] Schafarik, Slav. Alt. 1, pp. 389, 391, 407.

Per. v. 772, tells us that Sinope was 'as some say, a place founded by Kritias of Kōos;' and Stephanus Byzantinus, that it was 'a place founded by Makritios of Kōs, as Phlegon asserts' (vide Sinope). It seems probable that the Kōos and Kritines, who figure as joint founders of Sinope in the legend handed down to us by Scymnus of Chios, were merely the representatives of Kritias of Kōs,—Kritias being converted into Kritines, and Kōs, the name of a place, into Kōos, the name of a person. By applying a like free criticism to another portion of these legends, we may conjecture—notwithstanding the nationality ascribed to Ambron—that he symbolized an ancient people once settled in the parts around Sinope; in other words, that Ambrones in ancient times was one of the names of the Celtic Paphlagones.

There are other reasons for believing that the Celtic tribes settled on the southern coast of the Euxine were not unacquainted with the names, the history of which we are endeavouring to trace. Strabo (12. 8. 7) mentions a people called Trēres as one of the marauding tribes that desolated Asia. From his account of them they seem to have been a branch of the Kimmerioi, and we can hardly avoid a suspicion that their name of Trēr-es is identical with the name of Trever-i, which at a later age appears as the name of one of the Belgic races in Gaul—the necessary letter-changes admitting of a satisfactory explanation. Now Stephanus Byzantinus mentions a Thracian tribe called Trēres, and also a people to whom he gives the name of Triēres, which is evidently a varied form of Trēres; and he tells us, quoting Arrian, that the Triēres were descended from Triēros, son of Ombriareus and Thrakē. As Arrian was a native of Bithynia, it would seem that we have here a mythus that was accepted in Bithynia and its neighbourhood, and that in these districts the Trēres of Thrace were supposed to be descended from a people personified by Ombriareus. The connexion between this mythical name and the names Umbri and Ombrikoi, which classical historians assign to certain tribes in Italy, is obvious.

Livy (5. 34) mentions Bituriges, Arverni, Senones, *Aedui, Ambarri*, Carnutes, Aulerci, among the Transalpine Galli that invaded Italy in the fifth century, B.C.; and Caesar (B. G. I. 11), tells us that in the year 58 B.C. the Helvetii, in their migration westward, laid waste the country of the Aedui and of the Ambarri, who were 'necessarii and consanguinei' of the Aedui, i. e. a confederate and kindred tribe. It must be confessed that *consanguinei* is a strong term; but when we remember the nature of Celtic clanship, it may be a question whether in this case it means anything more than a full participation in all the privileges of the Aeduan commonwealth. As the Aedui bordered on the south upon Ligurian tribes, I think it quite possible that the Ambarri may have been a Ligurian tribe adopted into the great clan of the Aedui. Now after their victory on the Ticinus, the Galli, we are told (Livy 5. 34), learnt that the district around them was called the Insubrian, which was hailed as a good omen, inasmuch as a district (pagus) of the Aedui was called that of the Insubres. They accordingly settled in the neighbourhood, and built Mediolanum (Milan). Here we have the difficulty, that we know of no district belonging to the Aedui of Gaul which was inhabited by Insubres, though there was within their borders a place named Mediolanum, and accordingly near this place our geographers locate the Insubres of Gallia. The Insubres of Italy were one of the most powerful tribes in Cisalpine Gaul, whence we may perhaps infer that the Transalpine Insubres coalesced with the Cisalpine, and so formed one people. It would get rid of many difficulties if we were to consider the Insubres and the Ambarri to be the same tribe. As the Insubres are called by certain Greek writers the Isombroi, not a few speculators have treated them as a tribe of Umbri. The question is one of difficulty, and, as I may have to examine it hereafter more carefully, I will not now discuss it further.

In tracing the settlements of the Cimmerii in the south of Europe, we gave reasons for believing that the Siculi

were a branch of that ancient people[1]; and as the Siculi were, if not the earliest, at least one of the earliest of the Italian races, we were led almost necessarily to touch upon the vexed questions relating to the colonization of central Italy. In tracing the fortunes of the Ligures, we are again brought face to face with this difficult inquiry. As the Siculi seem to have reached the Tiber from the shores of the Adriatic[2], so the Ligurian tribes seem generally to have descended upon it from the north. In the time of Herodotus the Siculi had disappeared from the face of Italy, and the historian and his countrymen appear to have looked on the Peninsula as mainly peopled by three races, the Ombrikoi on the north (4. 49), the Opikoi in the centre, and in the south the Oinōtroi.

The Ombrikoi I believe to be closely related to the great Celtic family whose history we are investigating in the present chapter. But before we discuss more particularly the Celtic relations of this people, it may be advisable to smooth the way by endeavouring to get clearer notions as to the relations which existed between the Opikoi and the neighbouring tribes — more especially the two great historical families, the Samnites and the Latins.

Dionysius tells us (1. 11) that M. Porcius Cato, C. Sempronius, and the best informed of the Romans, held the Aborigines to be a Greek people that came into Italy many generations before the Trojan war; and he infers that they must have been Arcadian Oinōtroi, who were the first of the Greeks that peopled Italy. The Oinōtroi in the south of Italy were descended, according to a well-known mythus, from Oinōtros, son of Lukaōn, son of Pelasgos; and when the Hellenic Greeks began to colonize Magna Graecia in the seventh century B.C., they gradually conquered these the earlier inhabitants, giving to the conquered race the name of Pelasgoi, and themselves taking the name of Italiotai (vide Steph. Byz. *khios*). According to Pausanias

[1] Vide p. 15. [2] Vide p. 11.

(8. 3. 5) the Oinōtroi settled in Italy eighteen generations before the Trojan war, i. e., following the usual computation, about eighteen centuries B.C. From these Oinōtroi, or from some kindred tribe, the 'Aborigines' may have been descended, according to the suggestion thrown out by Dionysius.

According to Dionysius (I. 9) the 'Aborigines,' assisted by the Pelasgoi and other Greeks, drove the Sikeloi from Latium. The name Pelasgoi, it has been supposed, was connected with the adjective *palai-os*, old, so that we might look upon it as signifying the old people, the ancient tribes of Greece—a meaning which I believe satisfies the requirements of every passage in which the name occurs. The etymology of the name Aborigines has been disputed, though it appears to me to admit of no reasonable question. The prefix *ab* has a privative signification; *sonus*, a tone, *absonus*, dissonant; *similis*, like, *absimilis*, unlike; *do*, to proffer, *abdo*, to hide, &c.

According to this analogy, *Aborigines* might signify those who could be traced to no distinct origin—obscure, indigenous, and what might now be called prehistoric races. The name was applied to the Latins as early as the beginning of the third century B.C.; for the Sicilian historian Callias, who flourished at that period, spoke of Latinus king of the Aborigines (Dion. I. 72). Dionysius himself (I. 10) supposed the Latins to be descended from the Aborigines, and such appears also to have been the opinion of Cato, for he looked upon the Aborigines as being of Greek origin; and this conclusion seems to be the natural sequel of such a premiss.

The Aborigines, the Sabines, and the Umbrians neighboured on each other so closely as to occasion perplexity to historians in ancient as well as in modern times. Philistus of Syracuse represented the Sikeloi as having been expelled by the Pelasgoi and the Ombrikoi (Dion. I. 22), which seems to show that he confounded the Ombrikoi with the Aborigines. According to Zenodotus of Troezen,

who wrote a history of Umbria, the Umbrians were driven by the Pelasgoi from the country about Reate to the district afterwards known as the Sabine country, where they took the name of Sabines (Dion. 2. 49), a statement which may be partly explained by the fact mentioned by Cato, viz. that the Sabines expelled *both* Umbrians and Aborigines from the valley of Reate. The Ager Reatinus, or vale of the Velinus, east of Rome, seems to have been the native seat of the Aborigines; and according to Cato (Dion. 2. 49), the Sabines descended upon them from the neighbourhood of Amiternum, and took from them their chief town, Cotynae. The general opinion of antiquity seems to have been, that these Sabines were a tribe from Laconia—Oebalii according to Ovid (Fasti 1. 260), and Lacedaemonii according to Plutarch (Rom. 16); but Niebuhr and his school side with Zenodotus, and make them Umbrians.

Strabo (5. 4. 12) represents the Samnites to be descended from the Sabines. 'The Sabinoi having been long at war with the Ombrikoi, vowed to consecrate the produce of the year, as some of the Greeks are wont to do; and having been victorious, some part of the produce they sacrificed, and the other part they dedicated as offerings: but a dearth happening, it was said by some one that it was necessary to dedicate their children. This they did, and the children that were born at that season they proclaimed the children of Arēs; and when grown to manhood they sent them away as a colony, a bull conducting them: they found it lie down in the country of the Opikoi; and having expelled this people they settled there, and sacrificed the bull to Arēs, who had given it them for a leader according to the oracle. It is likely therefore that they got the appellation of Sabelloi as a diminutive from the name of their ancestors, and Samnitai, which the Greeks pronounce Saunitai, for some other reason. But some say that Laconians were settled among them, and that they are well inclined to the Greeks, and that some of them are also

called Pitanatai[1]. But this seems to be a fable of the Tarentines, concocted by them to flatter a people who live on their borders and have great power.'

We might infer that the Samnites considered themselves to be a Sabine people from the fact that they stamped on their coins the name Safinim. The Romans evidently considered Sabines and Samnites to be connected races, for they gave to both the name Sabelli. We may therefore reasonably conclude that Strabo's account of the Sabine origin of the Samnites is in substance correct. Let us endeavour to get somewhat clearer notions as to the relations which existed between the Opikoi and the tribes around them.

Aristotle (Dionysius 1. 72) gave the name of Opica to Latium; and Thucydides (6. 2) represents the Opikoi as the people who expelled the Sikeloi from Italy, and (6. 4) speaks of Cumae as lying in the Opican district. The Opikoi must have been the same people as the Latin Osci, for according to Festus, Ennius gave the Osci the name of Opsci, which of course is a corruption of Opisci. Opikoi and Opisci have evidently the same root, and the etymology is not far to seek. The oldest name of Italy was Saturnia (Dionys. 1. 19); and the Saturnalia were the most ancient religious rites known to the Italians. The yearly feast to Saturn and Ops is said to have been introduced at Rome by Tullus Hostilius. The licence tolerated during the Saturnalia has become proverbial; and there can be little doubt that the *numerus Saturnius* of Horace (Ep. 2. 1. 157) was merely another name for the Oscan ribaldry, which according to Tacitus (Ann. 4. 11) required at last to be restrained by authority. Ops the wife of Saturn was the goddess of plenty, and the Opalia, as her rites were called, were celebrated at the same time as the Saturnalia. The Osci were, I believe, the men of the 'Saturnian land,' as Virgil calls it (Georg. 2. 173), who

[1] Pitane was one of the divisions of Sparta, and Tarentum, it will be remembered, was a Spartan colony.

worshipped this beneficent goddess, and practised her rites.

In Campania and other districts where the Samnites established their supremacy, inscriptions have been found the language of which bears a close affinity to the Latin; and scholars are generally agreed in calling the language of these inscriptions Oscan. Niebuhr and his followers consider the language to be not that of the Samnites, but of the races they conquered; a conclusion the reader will be slow to admit, when he remembers that public inscriptions are generally written in the language of the dominant, and not of the subject race. Moreover, in the third Samnite war, the Roman general sent spies who knew Oscan to gain intelligence in the Samnite camp (Livy 10. 30); whence I think we must infer that the language generally spoken among the Samnites was an Oscan dialect.

The term Oscan seems to have been used to denote all the dialects spoken by the old Greek races in central and southern Italy. According to Festus (p. 35) the Bruttii spoke Greek and Oscan; and the Fabulae Atellanae performed at Rome were in Oscan. The uncultivated dialect prevalent in the great city among the humbler classes seems to have been known as the Oscan or Opic, and Juvenal (Sat. 6. 455) expresses his dislike of the fastidious lady who corrected the language of her 'Opic' friend. Perhaps we may look on the Latin as being merely an Oscan dialect modified by the peculiar influences brought to bear upon it in the neighbourhood of Rome, and the language of the 'Oscan Inscriptions' as exhibiting another phase of the language, which Samnite use had in certain localities raised to the dignity of a national language.

We have concluded that the term Oscan was originally applied to those who practised the old Saturnian rites, and were of Greek descent. The religious rites of a people readily pass to their neighbours. According to Cato (Dion. 2. 49), Sabinus son of Sancus was the tutelar deity of the Sabines; and Silius Italicus (8. 422) calls this deity Sabus.

As Seb was the name the Egyptians[1] gave to Saturn, and as Pliny tells us (3. 17) that in the opinion of some persons the Sabines were called 'a religione et deorum cultu Sevini,' we may conjecture that Sabini originally meant nothing more than the worshippers of Seb, i.e. of Saturn. According to Varro, Festus, and others, there was a Hercules Sancus worshipped at Rome, and from the Eugubine tables it would seem, that the Umbrians worshipped a god named Sancus, whence we may perhaps infer, that Sabine rites had penetrated into Umbria as well as into Rome. As new political combinations arose, the name of Sabines or Samnites came gradually to signify a race, and that of Oscan to designate a class. Strabo distinguished the Sabines both from the Opikoi and from the Ombrikoi. The Tarentines would hardly have ventured to flatter their Samnite neighbours by deriving them from Sparta, if the latter had not had some pretensions to a Greek descent.

A well-known passage in Solinus (2. 11), which is copied verbatim by Servius (Æn. 12. 753) runs thus:—'M. Antonius relates that the Umbri were the descendants of the old Galli,' &c. It has been supposed that the M. Antonius here referred to was M. Antonius Gnipho, the rhetorician, whose lectures were attended by Caesar and by Cicero. As Gnipho was not only a very learned man, but also a native of Gaul, his testimony on such a subject would be entitled to great weight. The phrase 'the old Galli,' seems to show that Roman antiquaries recognized a Celtic race that had preceded the Cisalpine Gauls as immigrants into Italy. These earlier Celts seem to have been in the mind of Lucan, when he represented (4. 9) the Celts of Spain as 'fugitives from the old race of the Galli,' i.e. as I have elsewhere[2] ventured to conjecture, tribes worsted in the intestine feuds prevalent among the Aquitanian Ligures and driven to seek a new country further westward.

[1] Melampus is said to have brought from Egypt the story of Cronos (Saturn) and the Titans (Diod. 1. 97).

[2] Vide pp. 71, 72.

Herodotus evidently considered the Ombrikoi to occupy the whole of the north of Italy, for he tells us the two rivers above them, the Carpis and the Albis, flowed into the Danube (4. 49). Pliny (3. 8) states that in ancient times the Pelasgi drove the Umbri from Etruria, and that these Pelasgi were expelled by the Lydi, who from one of their kings were called Tyrrheni, and afterwards took the name of Tusci. We have elsewhere[1] concluded that the Pelasgi here alluded to were the ancient Tyrrheni, who had sunk into decay when the Rasenna of Lydia landed in the country, and either by conquest or alliances gained an ascendancy, and once more gave to the name of Tyrrheni something like its former splendour.

In another passage (3. 19) Pliny tells us that the Umbri drove the Liburni and Siculi from certain districts in the Adriatic, and that the Tusci afterwards took from the Umbri no less than three hundred towns. From his mention of the Galli as the people who in their turn drove out the Tusci, it would seem that Pliny considered the three hundred towns, or at least a portion of them, to lie in the plain of the Po, whither we know that the Tusci extended their conquests. The marked distinction which at a later period existed between the Umbri of the Apennines and the Ligures of north-western Italy may have been owing to the intrusion of this foreign element between them.

If the Umbri were Celts, we might expect to find traces of Celtic names in districts where they were settled. The wooded range which separated Latium from Etruria was called Mons Ciminus. The Welsh *cefyn*, a ridge, which so often appears in the topography of the Welsh border under the form of Chevin, no doubt gave a name to the French Cevennes—the Cebenna of Caesar. In Strabo the name takes the more archaic form of Kemmenon, and the connexion between Kemmenon and Cymenus is obvious.

[1] Vide Chap. VIII. below.

Again, Festus tells us (lib. 13) that *ocris* in ancient times signified a rocky mountain; and east of Rome were the towns Ocriculum and Inter Ocrea, the former being an Umbrian city (Livy 9. 41). These names must be connected with the Welsh Ochyr, s. m. pl. ochrau, a side, an edge, a rim: whence comes Ochr-eu s. f. a side, a shelving region. But in Latium the Siculi bordered closely on the Ligures and the Umbri, so that there must always be great uncertainty in fixing upon the particular Celtic race to which these Celtic names belonged.

In Chapter I. we endeavoured to trace the course of the first Celtic migration westward, that migration which Moses seems to have considered as representing in a more especial manner the people of Gomer. The Kimmerioi, as the Greeks called these wandering hordes, seem to have passed away from Greece in two streams, one along the northern coasts of the Mediterranean, and the other northward, along the course of the Dnieper, to the Ukraine, and then westward, along the Elbe, to the Western Ocean. The Celtic races with which we have been more particularly engaged in the present chapter reached the midland of Europe by way of the Danube, and appear to have migrated for the most part from the northern shores of the Euxine. Each of these great movements of people no doubt consisted of various migrations that left Asia under different leaders, and at different times. We must not suppose that the migrations of the Kimmerioi and of the Ligures can be separated from each other by any fast and dry line, though there is a peculiarity in the names assumed by these Celtic races which is remarkable, and might almost tempt us to look upon it in the light of a shibboleth. We have concluded that the name Kimmerioi was derived from Gomer merely by hardening the initial guttural (vide p. 7). The Ligurian Celts called themselves through all their tribes, Ambrones, with which in all probability the name Umbr-i is connected. I cannot suppose that a name thus widely used by these tribes could be other than their old patri-

archal name of Gomer. If so, the initial g must have been dropped. This letter-change is one of the commonest in the modern Celtic dialects, and appears to have been well known in ancient times, for few readers will doubt that Ptolemy's Ottadēnoi were the same people as the Gododyn who furnished a name for Aneurin's well-known poem. But though this letter-change may have been in common use among the Ligurian Celts, I would not venture to say that it was peculiar to them. It is so widely diffused among the modern Celtic dialects, that any attempt to restrict its use among the more ancient dialects would be hazardous speculation.

The Ligurian races overspread the plains of the Upper Danube, penetrated over the Julian Alps into Italy, and pushed their way westward to the Pyrenees, and finally into Spain. In such a vast extent of country they must have been exposed to influences the most diverse, and when we remember how close were the relations into which some of them were brought with Rome and its civilization, we can understand how few are the remnants of this Celtic nationality which have survived to our own times. We must also remember that peculiarities of Ligurian speech and manners were acted on not merely by the proximity of the Latin races, but also by the neighbourhood of Celtic tribes which were akin to, though apparently distinct from, the Ligures. We have spoken of the Umbri, but there were doubtless other waves of Celtic immigration which poured into Italy from the Euxine, and brought with them disturbing influences. Among the latest of these immigrants were the Veneti.

The Henetoi, or as the Latins called them, the Veneti, dwelt, according to Hecataeus, on the Amisene Bay (Strabo 12. 3. 25, p. 553). In a note by Eustathius on Dion. Perieg. (378) occurs the passage: 'Arrian says the Enetoi having suffered in war against the Assurioi, and having passed away into Europe, are called up to this present time Benetoi (Veneti) instead of Enetoi,' &c. As Arrian was not

only a very eminent writer, but also a native of Bithynia, his statement on this subject is entitled to great weight, and I have little doubt is substantially correct. The story of the Veneti traversing Thrace under the conduct of Agenor on their journey westward from Troy is the shape we might expect the tale to take, when it was manipulated by Greek poets in later times. Such was the shape given to it by Sophocles in his lost tragedy called the Fall of Troy (Strabo 13. 1. 53, p. 608), and the fable is reproduced by later writers. Those who prefer substance to shadow, will be content with the tale as it is told by Arrian.

When the Henetoi were expelled from Asia we are not told, but I think we may infer from the statement in Arrian that their expulsion was one of the results that followed the campaigns of Esar-haddon in the seventh century B.C. Latin geographers write as if the Henetoi were in their time still extant in Asia. Solinus when speaking of Paphlagonia, tells us 'it is remarkable for the place called Enetus, whence, as Cornelius Nepos relates, the Paphlagones, who were afterwards called Veneti, were brought into Italy;' and Mela, among the tribes of Asia, enumerates 'the Veneti, the Cappadoces, the Gallo-Graeci,' &c. These statements were evidently copied from older writers without taking into account the changes that had occurred since their time. Strabo, who was born in the neighbourhood, knew of no people existing in his day on the Euxine, who bore the name of Enetoi (12. 3. 8). He evidently supposed that, if any of the Henetoi were left behind, they must have mingled with and been lost among the neighbouring tribes. The Veneti of the Adriatic were, there is little doubt, the proper representatives of the Henetoi of Asia, but there was another people also called the Veneti, and supposed to be descended from the Henetoi, that were just as certainly aliens to them.

The Veneti of Gaul were settled at the mouth of the Loire, on the shores of an inland piece of water, now called the Morbihan, or little sea. Both the district and its capital

are called Gwened by the modern Bretons, and the French name Vannes still shows traces of the classical name Veneti. Gwynedd is also the Welsh name for North Wales, but it seems to have denoted originally that portion of North Wales which borders on the Menai, and to have been used with a wider meaning as the princes of that district extended their territory. Here, then, are three names which only differ from each other by letter-changes that admit of an easy explanation, and the places they represent all lie beside sheltered waters—the town of the Henetoi on the Amisene Bay, the Breton Gwened on the Morbihan, and the Welsh Gwynedd on the Menai. As from the Welsh *gwastad*, level, comes *gwastad-edd*, a plain, so from *gwyn*, fair, may have come *gwyn-edd*, the fair district, the district of quiet waters; and the derivation is the more probable, inasmuch as North Wales takes another name, *Gwyndud*[1], which is clearly a compound of *gwyn*, fair, and *tud*, a district. If the proposed derivation be a correct one, it forms an important link of connexion between the ancient and the modern forms of Celtic speech.

I have called the Henetoi a Celtic people. Homer (Il. 2. 851) represents them as a Paphlagonian tribe, and Latin geographers evidently took the same view of their ethnical relations. The remains of their language are too scanty to afford us means of ascertaining its affinities. Polybius (2. 17) says it differed from that of the Cisalpine Gauls; but, if the speculation I have ventured upon as to the origin of the name be well founded, the language must have had, to say the least, a Celtic character. Polybius (2. 17) calls the Veneti of Italy an ancient people; and according to Livy (5. 23) the Etruscans once possessed the whole of Italy north of the Po, with the exception of the Venetian corner (Venetorum Angulus); whence we may perhaps gather that the Veneti were settled on the coast

[1] From Gwyndud came Venedotia, one of the mediaeval names for North Wales.

before the Etruscans established themselves in the north of the Peninsula. As however it was in the course of the fifth century B.C. that the Etruscans were expelled by the Gauls, and we have concluded that it was the conquests of Esar-haddon in the seventh century B.C. that made the Henetoi immigrants into Italy, it would seem that the settlements of the Veneti, of the Etruscans, and of the Galli must have followed each other in quick succession. The Veneti on their arrival in Italy dispossessed a people called the Euganei, who left traces of their name in various localities, and long continued to be recognized as a distinct race, particularly in the mountainous district bordering on the Veneti. According to Pliny (3. 20) the Euganei were considered by some to be of Greek origin. As according to Italian legend more than one body of Greeks landed in this part of Italy, such was not improbably the real origin of this people. Herodotus locates Henetoi in Illyricum (1. 196), whence we may infer that some of them remained in Greece when the main body sailed to Italy. In like manner the Siculi and Liburni left traces of their passage through Greece in their journey westward.

Of the rivers emptying themselves into the Euxine, the three whose names are most frequently met with in classical literature are the Phasis, the Borysthenes (Dnieper), and the Danube. The Phasis was the principal drain of Colchis, and in ancient times afforded the readiest and most frequented route to Media—a fact which explains the close connexion which is attributed to Media and Colchis in Greek mythus and legend. This connexion it is one of the objects of Russian policy to revive, and a few years will probably see the line of the Phasis again the great highway by which the commerce of Europe passes eastward into Persia. The same watchful policy has already reopened the trade that floated down the Borysthenes; and the marvellous rise of Odessa, which may be considered in some sort as the port of the Dnieper, shows how vast were the resources of the districts which had this river for

their outlet. It was by the route of the Borysthenes that the great migration, consisting of Kimmerioi, penetrated northwards from the 'Pontic Scythia,' while the Ligures and the kindred tribes worked their way westward up the valley of the Danube.

The Cimmerii must have spread themselves northward. and also over the Mediterranean coasts, at a period of the most remote antiquity. According to Greek antiquaries the Greeks settled in Italy some eighteen centuries B.C. (vide p. 11), and the Cimmerii had certainly reached that country before them. The Ligurian tribes were on the move later than the Cimmerii, but still at a very early date. The Ibēres, we have concluded, were displaced by the Egyptian colonists in Colchis, and Colchis was probably settled by one of the Pharaohs of the old monarchy, in other words, before the time of Abraham. The Ligures certainly came after the Ibēres, but were not, I think, many centuries behind them. The Colchian colonies on the Adriatic would, as long as they flourished, be a serious bar in the way of Ligurian movements westward, and I believe the Ligures were settled in Noricum and on the upper Danube before Olchynium, Pola, and Oricum were founded by the Colchians. The Umbri in all probability penetrated into central Italy before the year 1000 B.C.; for Cato tells us (Pliny 3. 4. 19) that Ameria, one of their towns, was founded at a date which answers to 1035 B.C. The Ligures may have passed into Spain and driven the Sikanoi from the Ebro a century or two later. The last Celtic migration into Italy was no doubt that of the Veneti. We may fix it with all but historical certainty early in the sixth century B.C.

CHAPTER IV.[1]

Early military races; our knowledge of them derived mainly from the Bible-narrative; objections to its credibility considered; antiquity of man; the creative days; the deluge; subsidences of the earth's surface; story of the Atlantis; migration to Shinar; confusion of tongues. — Eber (Melchizedek) passes westward; father of the Joktanite Arabs; his relations to the Ibrim (Hebrews) and to the Philistines. — Jerusalem an ancient centre of religion. — Probable settlement of Melchizedek in the valley of the Kedron.

Dignified position held by Eber in the Jewish annals. — The phrase 'Asshur and Eber' used by Balaam to denote all the races which are now called Shemitic, and his prophecy could not have been published much later than the year 1400 B.C. — Lud and Aram. — The Rutennu represent Asshur. — Fortunes of Nineveh. — Changes in the meaning of the word 'Ibrim.' — Identity of Melchizedek with Eber. — Palestine and its neighbourhood known to the Egyptians as the land of the Ibrim, and as *ta neter*, or the holy land; may have received both names as being the seat of this great Patriarch.

In the preceding chapters we have rapidly glanced over the history of the three great colonizing races of western Europe—the Cimmerii, the Iberes, and the Ligures; and have only incidentally noticed the disturbing influences which operated from without, and interfered with their peaceful settlement. We have now to turn our attention to the

[1] According to his original plan Dr. Guest included in a single chapter (IV) the discussion of the several topics which fall into Chapters IV, V, VI and VII, as they now stand. Some time before he ceased working he had begun to recast this part of the book, and had partially rearranged the matter of Chapter IV, in four chapters, expanding the argument as he proceeded. Upon this he was engaged when he was finally compelled to give up work. This fact must account for the abrupt transitions which mark the following chapters as being somewhat fragmentary; and for the want of proportion between them. It also explains how certain passages, in different connexions, occur in almost identical words.

military races, which at different times attacked and in part subdued them. Our knowledge of the latter races is chiefly to be gathered from that wonderful book, whose authority has of late been so rudely questioned. I have treated the Bible narrative hitherto as worthy of credit, but, now that I am about to make it in a more especial manner the basis of my reasoning, it may be well to state the grounds on which I rest its claim to our confidence. The subject is a momentous one, and I hope to meet with indulgence though I treat it more fully than is usual with respect to matters merely introductory.

Men of literary and scientific standing have started theories as to the antiquity of man, which conflict not only with the views I have laid before the reader, but also with the narrative contained in the first chapter of Genesis. I am one of those who believe that narrative to be simple history; and, as every one is now expected to render reasons for his faith, I give mine—not as affording a full solution of a most difficult problem, but as reasons that satisfied a mind which I may venture to call honest, and which is certainly more inclined to question than blindly to acquiesce in generally received opinions. The conclusions about to be submitted to the reader's judgment were arrived at in early life, when I had to stand on my defence against German rationalism; they have been modified but not materially altered by the later discussions that have taken place in our own country.

'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' I do not see how any critical and unprejudiced mind can give to these words other than one meaning, *In the bygone eternity* God created, &c. The Jews who wrote the Septuagint rendered the phrase 'In the beginning' by the very Greek words which St. John afterwards used in the opening of his Gospel 'In the beginning was the Word,' &c.; and in the oldest Chaldee paraphrase, the next most ancient authority we can appeal to, we find it rendered by a Chaldee phrase which is equivalent to that used in the Septu-

agint. Where is the modern Hebraist whose opinion can for a moment be weighed against these venerable authorities?

'And the earth was without form and void (tohu and bohu); and darkness was upon the face of the deep.' According to Dathe's translation, which I would say carries conviction with it, the passage should be rendered 'and the earth became without form,' &c. Here then we are carried at once from the creation of the earth to that period in the earth's history when chaos and darkness overspread the land which was to be man's dwelling-place. What was the nature of the darkness we can only conjecture, but there is a passage in Jeremiah (4. 23) which seems to point not obscurely to the agency employed in producing it. The prophet likens the ruin of Israel to the confusion of chaos. 'I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form and void (tohu and bohu); and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly.' Here we have the very phrase 'tohu and bohu' which is found in Genesis and nowhere else in Scripture save in this passage. We can therefore hardly be mistaken as to the reference intended, and we may, I think, fairly illustrate the earlier passage by the later one. Now in the geological periods immediately preceding those in which man left traces on the earth, the crust of the earth was subjected to fearful convulsions. The Alps, the Apennines, the Pyrenees, the Carpathians, &c. were then extruded above the earth's surface. These stupendous upheavements carry us beyond the range of man's experience. What physical effects would follow the extrusion of such vast molten masses no 'physicist' could tell us, were he simple enough to attempt it. But we know there are agents in nature, which, if liberated, would either in solution or vapour quench the light of any midday sun, and, for aught we know to the contrary, the very atmosphere might be dissipated above the seething cauldron. Curious however though the inquiry be as to the nature of the darkness,

there is one no less interesting and more to our purpose, as to the portion of the earth's surface which it covered. The question is an important one, and has not met with the attention it deserves. My scanty limits barely allow me to glance at it.

That the ground on which we tread is made up of strata, each containing its peculiar remains, vegetable and animal, is known to every one; and the revolutions in vegetable and animal life which these remains indicate have given rise to speculations the most varied and discordant. Many of these strata cover vast areas; and it has been supposed by some that the globe has been subjected to successive catastrophes, each of which was followed by a new creation, while others maintain that new conditions of the earth's surface led gradually to the extinction or, it may be, to the variation of the older types of being, and that there has been no sudden and abrupt break in the chain that united the earlier and the later forms of life. I think no sensible man can read the works that have been written in support of these different views, without being satisfied, that the writers are dealing with an indeterminate problem. We have not the data before us necessary to arrive at any definite conclusion on the subject. Remains of animals allied to the Kangaroo are found in our English oolites—and the family of the pouched animals form the more important part of the Australian fauna—whence it has been supposed that Australia is the remnant of a vast continent that once stretched over half the globe—a paradise of Kangaroos[1]. Till we find in English oolite the remains of some animal now actually existing, or which has existed in Australia,

[1] A few years back a skull belonging to the 'Prehistoric Man' was brought to London from Scotland. The eminent person whose hypothesis I am alluding to, thought (according to newspaper report) that it resembled the skull of an Australian: so we were to infer that there was a time when the Australian variety of man as well as the kangaroo was to be found in Britain! There were no circumstances connected with the finding of the skull inconsistent with the belief that the human being it belonged to was living within the last ten or twelve centuries.

the reader will probably consider these speculations as little better than a scientific dream. On the other hand, we sometimes have a new stratum discovered, with its peculiar fossils, interpolating as it were a new order of beings between old and familiar groups, and thus shaking our confidence in conclusions founded upon distinctions which further discoveries may possibly show to be the result of variation. Speculations like these create in me no uneasiness, though I fear that in too many cases they have been entered into from other motives than the love of science. Even were it demonstrated that classes of animals still living were in existence thousands of years before man was created, it would not shake my confidence in the historical character of the first chapter of Genesis.

The question whether the whole earth, or only some portion of its surface was covered by the chaos and darkness referred to in Genesis, would probably receive different answers according to the preconceived notions of the scholar or the geologist who had to answer it. The word rendered 'the earth' in our Authorized Version is the Hebrew *erets*. It is one of the boasted discoveries of modern criticism, though the principle rightly understood has been acted upon by competent critics in every age, that we must give to the language of an ancient author the meaning he himself and his contemporaries assigned to it. What was the meaning assigned by the ancient Hebrews to the word *erets*? The word occurs in Scripture many hundreds of times in one or other of the following senses; land as opposed to sea; some portion of the earth's surface, as the land of Judah, the land of Shinar, &c.; the ground and the substance of the ground, earth, soil, &c. Why should we give it an exceptional meaning in the opening of Genesis, and suppose that the darkness mentioned by Moses covered the whole globe? The Jewish mind at that period could hardly have conceived the idea which the English reader attaches to the word *earth*. We know what in later times was the popular view the Greeks took of the world around them. In

their eyes it was a round area encircled by the river[1] Ocean, out of which the sun rose every morning, and into which it sunk hissing every evening. Doubters there were of course; and one noted philosopher (Poseidonius), who had visited Cadiz and must have seen the sun sink into the Ocean, denied there was any hissing (Strab. 3. 1. 1, p. 138). Among the Romans the popular notions on the subject were very similar to those of the Greeks, save that instead of the river Ocean they talked of 'the outer sea.' In Roman eyes the inhabitants of these islands were 'Britanni separated from the whole world' (Virg. Ecl. 1); and if any large tract of land had been discovered in the Atlantic it would doubtless have been called, like America in a later age, 'the New World.' What idea Moses attached to the word *erets* we cannot tell, but he certainly had no notion of a terraqueous globe, and he probably used the word in a loose sense to denote the land on which man dwelt as opposed to the sky spread out above him.

It is an allowable supposition that the earth has had its habitable area from time to time accommodated to the wants and circumstances of man. Greek geographers distinguished between the inhabited area, ἡ οἰκουμένη, and the general surface of the earth; and Eratosthenes was taken to task by Strabo (1. 3. 3, p. 48) for not sufficiently distinguishing between the two. The notion which the ancients formed of the earth's area was a good deal influenced by the nature of their maps. These maps were generally long rolls which exhibited the outlines of the several countries greatly elongated from west to east and strangely compressed from north to south. The western extremity seems to have been always Cadiz or its neighbourhood, but the eastern varied with the knowledge of the map-maker. It was fixed by Plato at the Phasis (Phaedo 109); by

[1] In Greek we find two words that have been used to denote the ocean, *ōkeanos* and *ōgēn*. The root of both these words may be the Hebrew *Khug*, the circle of the earth (Isa. 40. 22), the compass of the face of the depth (Prov. 8. 27). If this conjecture be well founded the notion of an encircling ocean must be of the most remote antiquity, perhaps antediluvian.

Eratosthenes at the Himalayas (Strabo 2. 1. 1, p. 65); by Strabo at the Eastern Ocean (11. 11. 7, p. 519); and by Juvenal at the Ganges (10. 2). Dionysius (1. 3) represents the Roman Empire as conterminous with the habitable world.

The hypothesis, that the habitable area varied from time to time, agrees with the provision made for the first man in Eden, is in some measure countenanced by Gen. 4. 14 and Deut. 32. 8, and is not inconsistent with modern experience. Swamps are drained and forests felled to make room for man's abundant increase, and what man's agency now effects may at an earlier period have been wrought more immediately by God's good providence, or, to use 'philosophical' language, by the processes of nature. Before those convulsions which ushered in the age of man, the earth seems to have exhibited far greater uniformity as regards both climate and surface than at present. Shallow seas and lakes and wide plains like the steppes of Russia and the pampas of South America seem to have prevailed, and we may reasonably conjecture that where the surface was not broken up by the convulsions alluded to, it still retained in great measure these characteristic features. It is probable that after the Deluge large portions of Europe were covered with strings of lakes, the precursors of our modern valleys, and it is possible that as these lakes successively burst their barriers and lowered the level of their waters, they may in the course of a few centuries have swept together those heaps of gravel for the accumulation of which some recent inquirers have demanded thousands of years. When man first penetrated into western Europe he may have found little else but forests and lakes, or basins that had recently been lakes, and along the channels their waters scooped out as they escaped seawards he may have journeyed. Whether he found Britain separated from the Continent, or its northern portion elevated above the level of the German Ocean, are questions we may be fain to ask, but I fear we must wait long before we meet with

the geologist who can answer them satisfactorily either in the affirmative or in the negative.

There are few things in science more disheartening, and, considering the claims geology makes upon our deference, nothing more humiliating, than its utter helplessness when called upon to deal with questions of chronology. Whether certain phenomena be the result of a catastrophe or of ordinary causes working through a period of indefinite duration, is a problem which is no nearer its solution now, than it was thirty or forty years ago, when the scientific wranglings of Somerset House were the amusement of London. Many an assumption, that has been acquiesced in merely from despair of arriving at a definite conclusion, is treated by our modern speculators as if it were an acknowledged truth, on which they may base an argument. 'The Drift' and other ancient deposits were supposed to belong to a remote geological period, because in penetrating the earth's crust all traces of man disappeared before we reached them. Traces of man have lately been found in them, and we are told we must infer—not that these deposits are of recent date but—that man is of immense antiquity! Just as baseless is the inference drawn from the fact that the remains of man are found mixed up with those of 'extinct animals.' The wolf, beaver, bear, &c. are 'extinct animals' so far as regards Britain, yet there is reason to believe that the wolf was extant in the British islands as late as the fifteenth century, the beaver as the thirteenth, and the bear as the eighteenth; and any school-girl would laugh at the philosopher who told her that man was a denizen of Britain from a time of remote antiquity, because his bones were found mixed with those of the wolf or bear. The long-fronted cow (bos longifrons), the elk, the reindeer, and that huge brute the bos primigenius, have long disappeared from central Europe, but the bones of the bos longifrons have been found buried with British remains, and the elk, reindeer, and bos primigenius must have been remaining in the Black Forest in the time of Caesar, for it is generally

agreed that these were the animals intended by his alce, his bos cervi figurâ, &c. and his urus (B. G. 6. 26, &c.). We may then retain our composure, when we learn that the horns of the reindeer have been found in the caves of southern France, carved by the hands of man, and can only feel surprise at the pertinacious zeal with which these relics are paraded before our notice. I can hardly persuade myself that the writers themselves believe in the inference they evidently wish their readers to draw from the premisses. But the quiet assumptions which underlie these speculations are imposing, and the unhesitating manner in which they are brought forward exercises an influence even upon men of acknowledged ability. A geologist of reputation a few years back addressed a scientific gathering in the following terms[1]. 'The main fact upon which all the argument involving immensity of time really turns is the contemporaneous existence of man with the mammoth of the plains and the bear of the caverns. The remains of men are certainly buried with those of *extinct quadrupeds*, but did they live in those days?' &c. I quote the passage partly to show how easily our geologists slide into that loose phraseology of which I have been speaking; but more particularly do I quote it in order to enter my protest against the issue tendered. The issue presented to us by Professor Phillips *assumes* the very thing his geological friends have to prove.

I am one of those who think it probable that man was created before the drift was deposited, but under what precedent condition of the earth's surface I know no more than the geologists. I believe also that every animal that has been the contemporary of man has been living on this earth within the last six or seven thousand years. Whether the mammoth and the cave-bear, and other extinct animals that may have been man's contemporaries, came into being at an earlier date I do not stop to inquire,

[1] Inaugural Address to the British Association (vide 'Times' Newspaper Sept. 7, 1865).

as the earlier existence of these animals may well consist with my theory; but to assume that these animals were *not* living within the last 7000 years, as Professor Phillips impliedly does in the issue he tenders, is simply *a petitio principii.* I have carefully read the somewhat extensive literature that has been written on the subject before us, and have not seen any argument advanced which disproves the existence of these animals within that period, or which renders it in any degree improbable.

It is said that the existence of the elk, reindeer, &c. in Gaul and Britain indicates a climate colder than that which now prevails in those countries. In this conclusion I am inclined to agree, and think that a similar inference as regards climate might have been drawn from incidental notices that occur in the works of Caesar, and other classical authorities. It is probable for several reasons that in the 2000 years before his aera, and for some time afterwards, the climate of central Europe was gradually becoming milder. The 'glacial epoch,' as it has been termed, may possibly have filled the whole of the antediluvial period, and may not have passed entirely away even after the Deluge, though it probably did not long survive that event. What causes produced this gradual amelioration of climate is a subject of curious, but at the same time rather hazardous speculation.

The reader will have seen, from what has preceded, that I take a very *naturalistic* view of the great questions which have so much disturbed the public mind of late years. He will not therefore be surprised to find that I consider the word *day* as used in the first chapter of Genesis to mean a natural day of twenty-four hours. No doubt the word is sometimes used in Scripture to denote a longer period of time, and the last of the seven days certainly appears to have no limit assigned to it; but the phrase 'the evening and the morning' applied with such marked iteration to the other six days seems to me to define their duration. Whether the creative days were continuous or separated

from each other by intervals of time the narrative does not inform us, and I have no wish to speculate unnecessarily on a subject so difficult.

What then is our interpretation of the narrative on the hypothesis we have sketched out? On the first great day came light; on the second the atmosphere regained its normal state, the vapours rose in the expanse[1] and their waters were retained aloft in the shape of cloud; on the third day dry land appeared and the various forms of vegetable life started into being; on the fourth the clouds parted, and sun, moon, and stars poured their light upon the land which was to be man's dwelling-place; on the fifth animal life was generated in the waters; and with the land animals of the sixth day came the reasoning and immortal being, to minister to whose wants and comfort the whole of this beautiful creation was called into existence.

The principle that should guide us in our interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis seems to me a plain and simple one. Every statement made is made with reference to *man*. The 'erets' brought out of chaos and darkness into light and beauty was the land on which the antediluvian man was to dwell; the animals brought into existence were such as were to minister to his support or comfort, and when sun, moon, and stars again became visible, they were to be not merely dispensers of light and heat, as heretofore, but signs of times and seasons, objects to fix the attention of one who had faculties to understand the harmony of their movements. Looked at from this point of view, half the difficulties that surround the subject vanish. Let us briefly review some of the 'contradictions' which are said to exist between this portion of revelation and modern science.

One of the chief difficulties relates to the appearance of the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day. According to our Authorized Version God *made* two great lights. But the word here rendered *made* is very different from that

[1] See the rendering in the margin of our Bibles, Gen. I. 6.

rendered *created*; it admits of a much wider range of meaning, and may bear the sense—produced as the result of design or of natural causes, a meaning which supports the interpretation I have assigned to it. Both terms are used in the account of man's creation; let us *make* man, &c., and so God *created* man, &c. The first of these terms has a meaning large enough to cover even 'the Darwinian hypothesis,' if we only take care to substitute 'God's selection' for 'natural selection.' The latter term, if we may trust Jewish commentators, indicates a more special act of power, an actual calling into being, a creation—a meaning which the former may include, but does not necessarily imply. Wherever the word *made* occurs in the first chapter of Genesis we may substitute the word *produced*.

Again, the phrase 'the waters that were above the firmament' has excited the ridicule of our philosophers. Let us examine the grounds of their triumph. The Jews freely used figure and metaphor when describing natural phenomena; the heavens covered the earth, and God was said to stretch them 'as a curtain' and to spread 'them out as a tent to dwell in' (Isa. 40. 22); they were stable, round in circuit, and resplendent, and they are described as 'strong and as a molten looking glass' (Job 37. 18); the rain fell from them, and their 'doors' (Ps. 78. 23) or their 'windows' (Gen. 7. 11) were said to be opened; their waters were bound in a garment (Prov. 30. 4) and the clouds that bore their waters were 'the bottles of heaven' (Job 38. 37). At a later period 'philosophers' began to speculate on the cosmogony, and various were the theories they propounded; the earth was an island swimming in the Ocean (Thales); it was a cylinder floating in the air (Anaximander); the sun was a red hot stone as big as the Peloponnesus (Anaxagoras); the moon was a condensed cloud (Xenophanes); the heaven consisted of one or more crystalline spheres revolving with the sun, stars, &c., round the earth, &c.; (Anaximenes, Eudoxus, and others). Unbelieving

criticism robs the poor Greek of his folly and fathers it upon Moses. We are gravely told that the ancient Hebrews supposed the heavens to be a solid vault sustaining the sun, moon, &c., and furnished with doors and windows through which the rain descended on the earth from the reservoir above the firmament. The ancient Hebrews were no such simpletons. They knew whence the rain came quite as well as the modern sceptic. 'When He uttereth His voice there is a multitude of waters in the heavens, and He causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth; He maketh lightnings with rain,' &c. (Jer. 10. 13). 'He causeth the vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth, He maketh lightnings for the rain' (Ps. 135. 7). 'He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them. He holdeth back the face of His throne and spreadeth His cloud upon it' (Job 26. 8, 9). 'He maketh small the drops of water: they pour down rain according to the vapour thereof; which the clouds do drop and distil upon man abundantly' (Job 36. 27, 28).

The whole of the unhappy criticism we are examining has arisen from the use of the word firmament. The phrase was borrowed from the Vulgate. Now—to say nothing of Dr. McCaul's criticism that *firmamentum* means, not that which is made, but that which makes firm and stable, as the atmosphere which supports the bird that soars, or the cloud that floats in it,—I say without availing ourselves of this resource—is it not obvious that in translating a passage describing a cosmogony, the translator must almost necessarily use language more or less coloured by the philosophical notions of his contemporaries, and consequently that no inference can be drawn from the nature of such language as to the cosmogony of Moses? We are then driven to speculate on the nature of the original Hebrew term, and strenuous have been the efforts made to 'hammer out' of the word *rakya* something that may support a foregone conclusion. *Raka*, the root of *rakya*,

means, we are told, 'to spread out by beating,' but as, when applied to the earth (Ps. 136. 6; Isa. 44. 24), it represents mere extent and area, surely it must have the same signification when applied to the heavens. Accordingly we find *rakya* rendered in the margin of our bibles by the term 'expansion.' This there can be little doubt was the real meaning of the word, and it agrees with the one I have adopted.

On the hypothesis we have started, the flood of Noah may have been merely such a one as was necessary to cover the *erets*, i.e. the earth's habitable area. It is stated that the waters covered 'all the high hills that were under the whole heavens,' whence it has been inferred, that the great mountain, which in recent times has been called Ararat, must have been covered, and consequently that the flood was spread over the whole globe. But the allusion is evidently to the hills of the *erets*, and we do not know that the mountain now called Ararat was within the *erets*, or that it then existed, for it lies in a volcanic district and may have been thrown up at a later period. Again, the calculations as to the amount of accommodation required for the various species of animals which must have been then existing upon the earth are beside the question, for the ark could only have been intended for the preservation of the animals specially created for, or—if the Darwinians *will* have it so—accommodated to the support and comfort of man, and for this purpose the space it provided was sufficient. The attempts made to show that the scriptural account of the flood is inconsistent with existing phenomena, deserve consideration rather from the scientific position of those who make them than from the weight of their arguments. Among the busiest and the most mischievous of these speculators have been the geologists.

The volcanic district of central France is well known to travellers. Its craters, its lava beds, and its ashes still covering the ground, were produced, as our geologists assure us, long before the period generally assigned to the creation

of man; and, according to Lyell (Elements of Geol. 32), the waters of the Deluge never could have swept over those ashes without disturbing them. Dr. Daubeny tells us (Volcanoes, 1st edn. p. 14) that if the most modern volcanoes had been active in any recent period they must have been noticed by Caesar, or Pliny, or Sidonius Apollinaris, and that the silence of the latter is particularly significant, inasmuch as he was Bishop of Clermont, in the midst of the volcanic district, and distinctly calls attention to the volcanic outbreaks in the neighbouring district round Vienne. This reference to the volcanoes round Vienne was omitted by Lyell when he quoted the passage (Elem. of Geol. 32).

In the Quarterly Review (Oct. 1844, p. 296), Sir F. Palgrave criticized Dr. Daubeny's argument, as he found it stated by Lyell, and, to show its unsoundness, he quotes two references to the volcanic disturbances near Vienne, one by Sidonius himself above alluded to, the other by Avitus, who was Bishop of Vienne some thirty years afterwards. In his letter to Mamertus, the predecessor of Avitus, Sidonius states that, amid the consternation produced by a threatened invasion of the Goths, the men of Auvergne derived consolation from the Rogationes, a church service which Mamertus had instituted when his own diocese of Vienne was suffering from other calamities. 'For it has not escaped my knowledge on account of what portentous and frightful occurrences the city entrusted to you by Heaven was deserted at the time these services were first established. For the enclosure of the city walls was shaken by the frequent movements of the ground; now fires oft rising into flames covered the tottering summits of the hills with a mountain of ashes; now in trembling tameness the bold stags made their strange lairs in the market place,' &c. (Apoll. Sidon. lib. vii. ep. 1 [1]). Avitus, in his homily on the

[1] 'Non enim latet nostram sciscitationem primis temporibus harumce supplicationum institutarum civitas caelitus tibi credita per hujuscemodi prodigiorum terriculamenta vacuabatur. Nam modo scenae moenium publicorum crebris terrae motibus concutiebantur; nunc ignes saepe flammati caducas

Rogationes, in like manner talks of the 'incendia crebra,' the 'terræ motus assidui,' and the 'nocturni sonitus,' &c., which spread terror throughout the neighbourhood of Vienne.

Dr. Daubeny claimed for the most modern volcanoes of Auvergne 'a high antiquity,' 'an aera as remote as is consistent with the fact of their posteriority to the foundation of the valleys' (p. 15). Lyell (Elem. of Geol. c. 32) found in the alluvium underlying the lava-currents of the Puy de Tartaret bones of animals 'closely allied to recent animals,' yet nearly all of them, according to M. Bravard, showing some points of difference,' &c. 'If the animals were drowned by floods which accompanied the eruptions of the Puy de Tartaret, they would give an exceedingly modern geological date to that event, which must in that case have belonged to the end of the Newer Pliocene or perhaps to the Post-pliocene period. That the current which has issued from the Puy de Tartaret may nevertheless be very ancient in reference to the events of human history, we may conclude, &c., from the deep bed the river Couze has excavated in the lava, &c.' 'During the time required for this operation the perishable cone of Tartaret, composed of sand and ashes, has stood uninjured, proving that no great flood or deluge can have passed over this region in the interval between the eruption of Tartaret and our own times.'

I would ask, why are we to assume that the animals were drowned at the time of the eruption? Why may not their remains have been deposited in the alluvium ages before the lava passed over it? When we scrutinize Sir Charles Lyell's argument, the *only* ground for ascribing to the eruption of Tartaret a remote antiquity is the depth of the channel which the river has worked out for itself in the basalt produced by the volcano; and that such a channel might have been excavated by the floods of two or three thousand years must be evident to any one who has

culminum cristas superjecto favillarum monte tumulabant; nunc stupenda foro cubilia collocabat audacium pavenda mansuetudo cervorum,' &c.

watched the wear and tear produced by the action of running water under similar or nearly similar circumstances.

Judging from the premisses, I would say that Sir F. Palgrave has dealt out somewhat hard measure to Dr. Daubeny, and has been over-indulgent to Sir C. Lyell. It was the latter that sharpened the arrow and handed it over to be used as a weapon against the truth of Scripture, and to him should have been addressed the rebuke that was administered. It must be confessed that some later works by Dr. Daubeny are open to animadversion, but they were unwritten, or at any rate unpublished, when Sir F. Palgrave wrote his criticism.

The changes the earth's surface had undergone was a subject of much speculation among the ancients. Traces of volcanic action are common in the districts they were acquainted with, and led them to indulge in these puzzling questions. They sometimes allude to catastrophes as if they were well-known historical events; and it is sometimes hard to say, whether they are building upon some obscure tradition or dressing up a mere speculation in the garb of history. The story of the Atlantis was a good deal discussed and led to much difference of opinion. It was said to have been a vast island lying in the ocean west of the Straits of Gibraltar, and to have been at last destroyed by an earthquake. I shall venture to discuss the question once propounded by Poseidonius (Str. 2. 3. 6, p. 102) and ask whether the story of the Atlantis be after all a fable?

Elevations or depressions of the earth's surface—sometimes over vast areas—are by no means of rare occurrence. In the year 1819 the Ullah-bund at the mouth of the Indus was raised some ten feet, and the adjacent parts depressed, the disturbance extending over an area of about fifty miles in length by sixteen in breadth. Three years afterwards 100,000 acres on the Chili coast were upheaved in like manner, and a similar elevation took place subsequently on

the shores of New Zealand. Why should our scepticism be excited by an account of similar occurrences in the Atlantic some 3000 years ago? Why must we consider a story which certainly obtained the credence of Plato unworthy the notice of modern criticism, and suppose that when the priests of Sais told Solon that a large island, which had been the seat of a great monarchy, was destroyed by an earthquake, and the adjacent seas rendered unnavigable by the mud, &c., it left behind it (Timaeus, 25), they were playing on the credulity of a stranger, or repeating an old wife's tale that had originated no one knew how or when? That the tale should afterwards be overlaid with fable is what might be expected, but there is no reason that I can see, why it may not have been originally based on truth.

Certain accounts which have been handed down to us by the early Carthaginian navigators countenance the story told by the priests of Sais. According to these accounts the Atlantic outside the Straits was a shallow sea, full of ooze and sea-weed, and rendered dangerous by the animals that frequented it. Avienus, who was well acquainted with the Carthaginian records, tells us—

> 'Hunc usus olim dixit Oceanum vetus,
> Alterque dixit mos Atlanticum mare;
> Longo explicatur gurges hujus ambitu
> Produciturque latere prolixe vago.
> Plerumque porro tenue tenditur salum
> Et vix arenas subjacentes occulat.
> Exsuperat autem gurgitem fucus frequens
> Atque impeditur aestus hic uligine,
> Vis vel ferarum pelagus omne internatat
> Multusque terror ex feris habitat freta;
> Haec olim Himilco Poenus Oceano super
> Spectasse semet et probasse rettulit.'
>
> *Ora Maritima*, 402.

Some parts of this description are consistent with existing phenomena though the locality is shifted. South of the Azores a vast expanse of sea, said to equal in extent one-third of Europe, is covered with floating seaweed; and the reader will remember the fears this circumstance

excited in the minds of the seamen who accompanied Columbus in his first voyage. Aristotle (de Mir. Ausc. 136) made the seaweed district only four days sail from Cadiz, and at an earlier epoch it may have lain much nearer Europe. The volcanic agency we have alluded to is still rife in the neighbourhood of the Azores, and may at an earlier period have affected a more northern area. That there have been subsidences of the land, not only in districts lying south of Britain, but also in the southern portions of the island, is certain. We find remains of submarine forests along our southern coasts, and also along the coasts of Norfolk and elsewhere. Our coasts have probably been oscillating for centuries, sometimes above and sometimes below the water-level. Some of the subsidences in the Channel may I think be fixed chronologically. I see no reason for questioning the proofs which Norman and Breton antiquaries have collected, to show that a vast area of low-lying woodland situate between Jersey and the mainland, and known as the Scisciacum Nemus, was submerged in or about the year 709. The catastrophe on our own shores, recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the date 1099, may possibly have been owing to an unusually high tide; but under the date 1014 we are told that the 'sea-flood came widely over the land and drowned many towns and a countless number of people,' and I know of no event that would so well answer to such a description as one of those subsidences, traces of which are still visible on the coasts of our island. Occasionally we find these sinkings of the land obliterating the works of man. Not far from Bridgewater are the remains of a Roman road six feet below the level of high water (De la Beche, Rep. on Cornwall, 422). Here there must have been a subsidence of the land, unless we assume that the Romans before they made their road shut out the sea by means of a huge sea-bank, of which no traces now exist and no record has come down to us. Again, from Castle Acre in Norfolk runs a Roman road some twenty miles to

the north-westward, and then dies away as it approaches the sea. It is natural to suppose that the terminus of this highway—probably some great shipping-station—was drowned at the same time as the submerged forests in this neighbourhood. In Brancaster Bay, two or three miles to the eastward, are what are called the 'Burnham Grounds.' On the land we have a string of Burnhams. Burnham Westgate, Burnham Deepdale, Burnham Overy, &c., and the fishermen will tell you, 'there are three other Burnhams under Brancaster Bay.' If any credit be due to the tradition, there must have been a subsidence off Brancaster Bay at a comparatively recent date.

Professor Kjerulf of Christiania, a few years back, surveyed the Norway coast by order of his government. It appears that the elevation of the ancient sea-beaches above the present sea-level is much less than Sir C. Lyell represents it to be; and it is patent that the raising of the Norway coast has been owing to the *fitful action* of some subterranean force. In America, India, New Zealand, &c., we meet with similar phenomena, evidently produced by forces acting at uncertain intervals. That regular and continuous action of the upraising force so generally assumed by those who maintain the enormous duration of our geological periods seems to be a thing unknown in nature.

In 1863 Sir C. Lyell published his work on the antiquity of man, and worked up in favour of his views various speculations relating to the age of the Danish peat-mosses, which had been advanced by continental theorists. He tells us, that in the lowest peat-beds are found trunks of the *pinus sylvestris* or Scotch fir, 'which is not now, nor has ever been in historical times a native of the Danish islands, and when introduced there has not thriven;' that at a higher level are found the trunks of oak trees, which must once have grown on the borders of the peat-swamps, and which have been now superseded by the beech. He tells us that a stone implement was found deep in the peat

under a fir-tree; that bronze swords, &c. have been taken out of the peat where the oak-trunks abound; and that 'the age of iron corresponded more nearly with that of the beech-tree.' Afterwards he proceeds (p. 16): 'what may be the antiquity of the earliest human remains preserved in the Danish peat cannot be estimated in centuries with any approach to accuracy. In the first place in going back to the bronze age, we already find ourselves beyond the reach of history or even of tradition. In the time of the Romans the Danish isles were covered as now with magnificent beech-forests. Nowhere in the world does this tree flourish more luxuriantly than in Denmark, and eighteen centuries seem to have done little or nothing towards modifying the character of the forest vegetation. Yet in the antecedent bronze period there were no beech-trees, or at most but a few stragglers, the country being then covered with oak. In the age of stone again the Scotch fir prevailed, and already there were human inhabitants in those old pine-forests. How many generations of each species of tree flourished in succession before the pine was supplanted by the oak, and the oak by the beech, can be but vaguely conjectured, but the minimum of time required for the formation of so much peat, must, according to the estimate of Steenstrup and other good authorities, have amounted to at least 4000 years: and there is nothing in the observed rate of growth of peat opposed to the conclusion, that the number of centuries may not have been four times as great, even though the signs of man's existence have not yet been traced down to the lowest or amorphous stratum.'

In some cases the growth of peat remains almost stationary for ages, and then, stimulated by some altered condition of the neighbourhood, developes itself with surprising energy. It cannot therefore be a trustworthy guide as to the age of a peat-moss. But it is more to our present purpose to call attention to the results of an exploration of a Danish peat-moss at a place called Thorsbjorg, which

were unknown to, or at least unnoticed by, Sir C. Lyell. The publication which first gave an account of them was passing through the press at Copenhagen at the very time Sir Charles Lyell was printing in England the work we have been quoting. In a peat-moss, supposed to have been the site of a sacred lake, were found vast numbers of iron weapons and utensils, which were apparently the offerings of an ancient superstition. Roman coins were found among them, and fixed the date to about the third century; and the numerous oak-trunks lying around them showed that the sacred lake was situate at that period in the midst of an oak-forest. The buried treasures of another sacred lake were shortly afterwards discovered at a place called Nydam. The weapons, &c. were evidently of the same age as those in the other moss; but there were also among them the remains of fir-built ships, and the trunks which abounded in the peat-bed showed that *this* sacred lake had been surrounded by a forest of pine trees. These facts have now been for some years known to every antiquary in Europe, and they show that Sir Charles Lyell's reasoning has no grounds whatever to rest upon. But there was on his part no recantation. His mischievous speculations were still allowed to circulate, and to do their work upon the weak and the ignorant.

I allude more particularly to these speculations of Sir C. Lyell because similar ones have been brought forward in reference to the fen districts in the east of England. The superficial covering of the fens, the 'marsh' as it is termed in some localities, consists of alluvium or 'warp' brought down by the fen rivers. Underneath lies the true fen, consisting of a peaty deposit, wherein are the remains of forests, the trees of which are sometimes found lying parallel to each other, as if they had been prostrated by a force acting in one particular direction. Underneath this peaty bed there is occasionally found another deposit, also containing the ruins of ancient forests. Traces of man, it is said, are met with, not only in the peat-bed and the

forest it covers, but also in the earlier forest that lies beneath it. As earthworks of early, perhaps of Roman date, are found erected on the 'marsh,' we are asked what must be the antiquity of the men who roamed in these earlier forests? The answer is not far to seek. There were probably successive sinkings of the land, and some portion of the buried forests may have been submerged long after other portions, and possibly centuries after the Romans had made their sea-bank. The traces of man said to have been discovered in these drowned forests, may have been left there for aught we know to the contrary by our own Anglo-Saxon ancestors.

The tendency to elevation which shows itself so conspicuously on the Norway coast, may be traced in the northern parts of Britain. Not far from Glasgow canoes have been dug up with accompanying circumstances which leave little doubt that the bed on which they were lying was once the bottom of an estuary, though now raised above the reach of the highest tides. Whether the level of the district has been deranged by any upraising force since the Romans built their wall between the friths of Clyde and Forth, is a question on which there is a difference of opinion. But we may, I think, safely conclude, that north of a line joining Norway and North Britain, the earth's surface has for ages exhibited a *tendency* to rise, and a corresponding tendency to sink south of that line.

Late explorations have shown that, for some distance to the west of Europe, the sea-bottom may be found at no great depth, and that it then sinks down suddenly to a depth of several thousand feet. Is there anything unreasonable in the supposition, that a portion of the shallower waters was at one time covered with islands? It was a popular Irish belief that an enchanted island called O'Brasil was occasionally seen from the western coast of Ireland (O'Flaherty, West Connaught, p. 65); and Giraldus Cambrensis (Top. Hib. 2. 12) refers to the island called Phantastica which had been lately seen in the Irish

seas. In 1674 was published in London 'The Western Wonder, or, O'Brazeel,' giving an account, somewhat in the style of De Foe, of a visit to the island. This is the earliest mention of the name O'Brasil that I have met with, but it must have been known long before, if any credit be due to O'Flaherty's assertion (W. Connaught, p. 69) that it was 'set down in navigation cards.' If it did appear in navigation charts it may have given a name to the Portuguese empire in South America[1]. May not the belief in the existence of this island be a reflexion of traditions that lingered on the Irish coasts long after the Atlantis had sunk beneath the ocean? May not the 'Imaireboy or the yellow ridge,' and in English the cod-fishing bank (Ib. 74), which stretched five or six leagues west of Ireland 'from Ulster to Munster, all along the western coast of Connaught,' be part of the substructure on which some of these islands rested? If some such hypothesis be allowed, we may easily account for the termination of the glacial period. We have only to suppose that the remains of this island-barrier, after it was shattered by the earthquake, were gradually worn away by the action of the sea, and that the gulf-stream, or, if we adopt the views of Dr. Carpenter, the oceanic currents, just as gradually worked their way to the western coasts of Europe, and the milder climate would follow as a matter of course. I am not the first that has brought in these currents to effect the change. Mr. Hopkins (Geol. Journ. 1852, p. 56) started the hypothesis, that the gulf-stream once flowed towards the Pole along the course of the Mississippi valley, and that it was only diverted towards Europe, when its course northwards was checked by the upraising of the North American continent. The hypothesis that has been submitted to the reader's notice requires for its support no such violent dis-

[1] It is commonly said that Brazil obtained its name from the brasil-wood it produced. I have not traced the history of this etymology, but it seems to be an improbable one.

turbance of the earth's surface, and seems to have something like tradition to rest upon.

If Unger and Heer may throw an Atlantis across the ocean to connect the 'Miocene Flora' of Europe with the analogous forms of vegetable life in America, why may we not call one into existence to solve the riddles of history? If the geologist thus disport himself, why may not the historian take a peep into fairy-land? Or does 'science' claim for itself a monopoly of the paradise where wise men restrain and the unwise indulge themselves?

We have little evidence to guide us in estimating the extent of the 'ėrets,' or habitable area over which the earlier generations of mankind spread themselves. There are, however, grounds for believing, that, while the Drift was depositing, there was a barrier of ice and snow stretching from the Alps to Britain, and the African Sahara must have been sea down to a comparatively recent date. Possibly these natural obstacles were the boundaries to the North and South. The Atlantic must have been the western boundary, but I can form no conjecture as to the eastern. The notion of Eratosthenes (Stra. I. 3) that the Mediterranean and the Euxine were once inland seas like the Caspian and the Aral is not an improbable one. The bones of the African elephant and the Barbary ape have been dug up in Spain, and according to E. Forbes the same Fauna once extended over North Africa, Spain and the Canaries; whence we may infer that these countries were once connected. Plato thought (Phaedo 109) that the inhabited districts between the Phasis and the Columns of Hercules were but a small portion of the real earth; and poets and philosophers were certainly dreaming of New Worlds centuries before Columbus realized the vision. The centre from which mankind spread themselves over the world around them seems to be marked out with tolerable precision. The name of Ararat, as indicating the mountain which now bears it, is the mere creation of modern geography, but as the name of a *district* it can be traced up

to a remote antiquity. Let us see what the Bible teaches us as to some of the migrations which appear to have proceeded from a neighbourhood so celebrated in the world's history.

'And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there' (Gen. 11. 1, 2). This passage seems to me to run parallel to the opening verse of Genesis, and to contain a particular statement subordinated to a more general one —the connecting particle, rendered in our version by *and*, being the same in both cases. The migration seems to have proceeded south along the caravan route from Hamadan, and then turning eastward reached the plains of Shinar through one of the passes of Mount Zagros. There is no reason for supposing that those who migrated included the whole of mankind then living. There would be no little difficulty in accounting for the absence of their names, if Noah and his three sons were present in Shinar during the events recorded as taking place there. The father of mankind and the three patriarchs probably remained in the neighbourhood of Ararat, while their descendants went out on all sides to people the adjacent districts[1]. The migration to Shinar was recorded, because it bore directly upon the fortunes of the peculiar people whose history it was a main object of the Bible to hand down to us. The movement seems from the first to have been distinguished by the ambitious aspirations of its leaders—'Let us build us a city, &c., and let us make us a name, &c' (Gen. 11. 4). They were not content to obey God's command to 'replenish the earth'; they would form great monarchies and get them 'a name,' among their brethren. The nature of the miracle which frustrated their intention has, I believe, been commonly misunderstood.

[1] The early fathers entertained different opinions as to the period of Noah's sojourn in 'Armenia.' According to Epiphanius (contr. Haer. lib. 1) he lived there during five generations.

It is generally considered that the confusion of tongues gave rise to the diversity of languages now prevalent on the earth. But every one that has studied the history of language knows that it still is and ever has been changing; and, moreover, that changes, which in our modern forms of speech would pass almost unnoticed, would in the earlier forms have deranged the syntax of a sentence, and rendered it unintelligible. A slight variation in the vowel, or in the accent—variations which probably have left no trace behind them—would be sufficient to produce the effect intended; and—speaking with reverence—we may assume that a supreme Intelligence would attain His purpose by the simplest means. It is not improbable that the confusion only affected the Shemitic and the allied families of language, and merely anticipated changes which the lapse of a few centuries would almost necessarily have brought about.

Of the various tribes who took their departure from the plains of Shinar it would seem that the children of Shem for the most part proceeded up the river, while the Hamitic races went southwards. Among the former was a patriarch whose descendants, though they did not form one of the early monarchies, have, during a long course of ages, widely influenced the fortunes of mankind. Of Eber, at least under the name of Eber, we know but little; and the nature of his relations to the Hebrew people has been the subject of controversy. The disputes have mainly turned upon questions of philology. Does the word *Ibri*[1], a Hebrew, mean one of the family of Eber, or, as the Septuagint renders it (Gen. 14. 13), one that passed over. The question has been argued on the principles of Hebrew grammar, but it is very improbable that Hebrew had taken the form which now distinguishes it as early as the days

[1] In Hebrew both Eber and Ibri take the guttural *ayin* for their initial letter, and there is consequently an inconsistency in our spelling Hebrew with and Eber without an *h*. The word which in the later Scriptures is spelt Heber takes a different initial, though even Heber may have been originally the same name as Eber.

of Eber, and therefore it is more than doubtful whether these principles are applicable to such a question, though Hebrew analogies may certainly furnish useful aids in the inquiry. In Hebrew are two connected words, *äber*, beyond, and *abar*, passed over, and it is an allowable conjecture that in the early stages of language *Eber* might signify him that passed over. *Ibri* might then, according to a well-known Hebrew analogy, signify him that belonged to Eber, i.e. him that took part with Eber in his migration.

One of Eber's sons was named Joktan, and he is generally identified with the Kahtan of Arabian tradition. Another of his sons was named Peleg, 'because in his days the earth was divided.' The root of Peleg means to divide. If we suppose that, when the tribes were scattered abroad, Eber obeyed the voice of God and crossed river and desert, and if we further suppose that some of his family refused to accompany him, we can readily understand how they would receive the name of Peleg, 'the Division,' just as in a later age the Jews settled among the Gentiles were called 'the Dispersion.' But, as the genealogy seems to be dealing with individuals rather than with aggregates of people, perhaps we may venture to give to the word Peleg the meaning 'he that was separated.'

The descendants of Joktan, Eber's sons, colonized districts which seem to have lain south and east of Palestine; 'their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the East.' Where Mesha was situated is unknown, but on the southern coast of Arabia is a sea-port called Zefari, which, from its position and the character of its neighbourhood, has been identified with Sephar. On the west of this place lay the district of Hadramaut and the country of the Sabaei—names we may at once identify with the Hazarmaveth and Sheba of Genesis (10. 26, &c.). The tradition also of the Arabs locates the Joktanites in Yemen, i.e. on the eastern side of the Red Sea[1]; but the name of Havilah

[1] I give to the name Yemen this general meaning in order not to distract the reader's attention with minute geographical details.

(Gen. 10. 29) seems to show, that some portion of this people still lingered on the skirts of the Northern desert, and held the Driftlands of the Euphrates probably in joint occupancy with the Cushites (Gen. 10. 7). In the time of Moses the Joktanites probably dwelt—interspersed it may be with other tribes—from the northern desert throughout the whole of Yemen. The patriarch himself, according to what was probably a general custom in these early times, seems to have remained in Canaan, where he first pitched his tent. Around him gradually settled not only the Canaanites but also those other ancient races, the Emim, the Zamzummim, the Avim, 'which dwelt in Hazerim even unto Azzah,' and in Abraham's time the Philistines.

It seems to be generally agreed by Shemitic scholars that the name Philistine meant an emigrant or wanderer. The Septuagint renders the term Philistine by a word which signifies foreigner; and it has been supposed that they were the Caphtorim that came out of Caphtor and destroyed the Avim, and dwelt in their stead (Deut. 2. 23); for Gaza (otherwise Azza), originally one of the cities of the Avim, was a city of the Philistines. Again, in Jeremiah (47. 4) the Philistines are called 'the remnant of the country of Caphtor,' and in Amos (9. 7) it is demanded of Israel, 'Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?' As the Israelites were exiles in Egypt and the Syrians exiles in Kir (2 Kings 16. 9; Amos 1. 5)[1], the inference seems clear that the Philistines were also exiles in Caphtor. If therefore the Philistines were the Caphtorim mentioned in Deuteronomy, they must have received the name of Caphtorim from having sojourned in Caphtor and not as being the native race of that district. The probability is that the people were carried into Caphtor by one

[1] The Syrian exile was probably of short duration. Amos twice alludes to it; once (1. 5) as a future, and secondly (9. 7) as a past event. But the chronology of this part of Jewish history is full of difficulty, and requires adjustment.

of the early Egyptian kings, and that, shortly before the arrival of Abraham in Canaan, a portion of them returned to their native country, and were called the Philistines or emigrants. I think there is reason to believe that Eber dwelt somewhere in the neighbourhood of the future Jerusalem, and the circumstance that the Philistines seem to have looked on the adjacent lowlands as their native country may raise a suspicion that they were at one time in some way or other connected with that patriarch. In the days of Samuel the Philistines were markedly distinguished from the Ibrim—but this is consistent with the supposition that there was some bond of union between them, social or political, at an earlier date.

When a patriarch or other public leader built an altar and made sacrifices thereon to obtain pardon and peace (salem) for his people, the place where the altar stood seems frequently to have taken the name of Salem or Shalom. 'Shalem, a city of Shechem,' no doubt obtained its name from the circumstance that Jacob erected an altar there, on land which he had purchased of the children of Hamor, Gen. 33. 20; and when Gideon cast down the altar of Baal and built an altar to the Lord, he called it Jehovah-Shalom (Judg. 6. 24). The most ancient authorities locate Melchizedek at Jerusalem; and if we assume that this patriarch here built his altar, we can understand how the place came to be called Salem—'In Salem also is his tabernacle and his dwelling-place in Zion' (Ps. 76. 2). The meaning of the term Jeru-salem has been a subject of dispute. The etymology which most commends itself to my judgment is that which makes it signify 'the place of Salem.' The Scriptures do not enable us to say how many years had elapsed since the death of Melchizedek when Joshua took Jerusalem. But the district was ruled by a chieftain who called himself Adonizedek (Josh. 10. 1), i.e. the Lord of righteousness; whence I think we may infer, that he wished Jerusalem to be considered as still

being the centre whence spiritual blessings flowed, and himself the representative of the great patriarch who had preceded him. Such pretensions would have been absurd if any great interval of time had elapsed since the death of Melchizedek. If we suppose that Melchizedek died some time before, but not very long before, the year 1600 B.C., the chronology suggested would allow a suitable date for the interview with Abraham, and would at the same time enable us to fix the date of Melchizedek's death at some point not inconsistent with the fact that Job makes no reference to him.

The hegemony claimed by Adonizedek seems to have been acknowledged by all the Amorites inhabiting the hill country north of Hebron (Josh. 10. 3). His defeat therefore must have made the whole of this district Israelitish territory.

The localities connected with Jerusalem are becoming from day to day better known to us. The great sewer of the temple, which for centuries carried the blood of the slaughtered victims, was traced some years back, and late research has, it is said, lighted on the sewer of Mount Sion (Jebus) up which Joab clambered when he took the fortress (vide 2 Sam. 5. 8). In the time of David the temple area must have been a ploughed field (2 Sam. 24. 16); and I think pretty general consent now admits that the rock under the mosque of Omar was the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. But if the temple area at that time —and, if then, certainly at an earlier period—belonged to the inhabitants of Jebus, it may be asked, where could Melchizedek have found accommodation for himself and his people? I would say that the phrase 'the King's dale' furnishes us with the answer.

We learn from Samuel (2. 18. 18) that 'Absalom in his lifetime had taken and reared up for himself a pillar, which is in the King's dale: for he said, I have no son to keep my name in remembrance: and he called the pillar after his own name: and it is called unto this day, Absalom's place.'

It is generally agreed that the structure in the valley of the Kedron commonly known as Absalom's tomb marks the site of this pillar. If this be so, then the valley of the Kedron must have been the King's dale mentioned in Genesis. Why it took this name we are not told. But supposing that Melchizedek lived here we have an obvious answer. Closely neighboured as he must have been by the Jebusites, it would indeed be difficult to say where else he could have lived, if, as we have assumed, he was resident at Jerusalem or in its neighbourhood.

When Abraham and his confederates returned from the slaughter of the kings, the king of Sodom, we are told, went out to meet him 'at the valley of Shaveh, which is the King's dale' (Gen. 14. 17). Here 'Melchizedek king of Salem' brought forth his bread and wine, and as 'priest of the most high God' blessed Abraham. It would seem then that in the valley of the Kedron the patriarchal Melek laid up his stores for the sustentation of himself, his dependents, and his friends. From this circumstance the valley would naturally take the name of 'The King's dale.' There are, I believe, no other circumstances mentioned or alluded to in Scripture which can explain the origin of this name. The way in which Moses both here and elsewhere (14. 5) illustrates and explains the word Shaveh shows, I think, that it must have been in his time an archaism, and consequently that at the time Genesis was written the valley of Shaveh could have been no longer a place of *familiar* resort to the Israelites. Melchizedek was probably dead.

The important place occupied by Eber in the history of the Shemitic races is strongly marked in Scripture. 'Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born' (Gen. 10. 21). I can best account for such a description as this on the supposition that not many generations before Moses wrote the passage Eber was living, the recognized head, or in other words the patriarch or religious centre of

a great community of tribes; and if the name of Ibri, which was given to Abraham (Gen. 14. 13), was derived from Eber, then the descendants of Abraham were no doubt one of the tribes that recognized in Eber the patriarch of their race. In Gen. 41. 12 Joseph is called an Ibri, and he tells the chief butler (40. 15) that he was 'stolen away from the land of the Ibrim.' The phrases 'Ibri' and 'the land of the Ibrim' must therefore have been well-known and familiar to the Egyptians. When Jacob and his family are brought before Pharaoh they are not introduced as Ibrim, but as a people of shepherds living in the land of Canaan. At that period the name of Ibrim was certainly not applied exclusively to the descendants of Abraham. It probably included 'all the children of Eber,' whether descendants of Abraham or not—all in short who had joined Eber in his migration, and looked upon him as the patriarch of their race; and it may have been thought too loose and indefinite a term to be used on a formal and ceremonious occasion like that of Jacob's introduction to the Egyptian Pharaoh.

Balaam concludes his prophecy (Numb. 24. 24) with the words 'And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever.' The ablest Hebrew scholars consider the '*he*' in the last clause to refer to the power which owned the ships, in other words to the Greek empire, whose destruction was the latest event shadowed forth in the prophetic vision. But the chief question we have now to consider is, what was the meaning attached in the prophecy to the word Eber? The writers of the Septuagint considered Eber to signify the Hebrews, i.e. the Israelites, but Balaam throughout the prophecy refers to this people by the names of Israel and Jacob. I believe the word Eber simply meant 'the children of Eber,' or in other words the various tribes which owned him as their patriarch, and that the phrase 'Asshur and Eber' was used by Balaam to denote generally what we should now call the Shemitic races—that is, all the kindred races around him, the men of the south. The

distinction between the two peoples is drawn with emphasis in the covenant Joshua made with Israel shortly before he died (24. 2). 'Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor: and they served other gods. And I took your father Abraham from the other side of the flood, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan, and multiplied his seed, etc.' Joshua was talking to the chosen people, and therefore speaks of their forefather Abraham; but Balaam had in view a larger aggregate of people, and therefore refers to the yet greater patriarch who had preceded Abraham in the immigration westward. The Rutennu, as the Assyrians of that period were called by the Egyptians, were commonly selected by them to represent the men of the north (vide Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 2. 39); and as the descendants of Eber were spread from Palestine to the southern coasts of Arabia, they would as naturally represent the men of the south.

The phrase 'Asshur and Eber' as used by Balaam was probably meant to include all the races now called Shemitic. When he was prophesying on the mountains of Moab, Balaam had behind him not only the descendants of Abraham — Edomites, Ishmaelites, &c., and of Lot — Moabites, Ammonites, &c., but also the Joktanite Arabs, who had migrated into Yemen (Gen. 10. 30). Before him was the wide region occupied by the Rutennu. This people, whom our Egyptologists are pretty well agreed in considering to be Assyrian, sank in the course of the fourteenth century B.C. beneath the attacks of the eighteenth dynasty[1]. Nineveh did not obtain its supremacy till sometime afterwards, so that in the year 1400 B.C. there was no predominant Assyrian power to fill the place

[1] The Greek name Assurioi long survived under the degraded form of Suroi or Surioi (Herod. 7. 63), to denote the people inhabiting certain portions of the ancient Assyrian empire. In like manner we find the name Rutennu occasionally used even as late as the Ptolemaic times to denote certain portions of the great empire which once bore that name.

which was evidently occupied by Asshur in Balaam's prophecy. I think we may not unreasonably infer that the prophecy was uttered while the empire of the Rutennu was still standing, or at any rate was still fresh in men's memory. If this be so, then Balaam must have flourished not long after the year 1400 B.C.

In the early Scriptures the country lying north of Palestine took the name of Aram, and that to the south the name of Lud. I draw this inference from the order in which the different districts are ranged in Gen. 10. 22: 'The children of Shem; Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.' Here the eastern districts begin with Elam on the Persian Gulf and end with Arphaxad in Armenia, the enumeration being according to what seems to have been then the customary mode of counting, viz. from the south northwards. The western districts are comprised in the sequence 'Lud and Aram'; and all the districts assigned to Aram in ver. 23, so far as they can be identified, lie north of Palestine, as the sequence to Lud and Aram might lead us to expect. The attribution of the name of Lud to the district south of Palestine agrees with notices found in the compendium left us by Abulfeda. West of Mount Seir and bordering on the northern desert is a place called Maan. This name I incline to think was connected with Mēon-es, the name by which Homer designates the Lydians. In various Assyrian inscriptions which Norris collects mention is made of a country called *Magan* or Makan. I believe we might get rid of many difficulties in early history if we considered this Assyrian name to have given rise to Maan and Mēon-es. But we cannot speak with confidence on the subject at present. The inscriptions require to be more carefully investigated before we can make them the basis of such important historical inferences.

It is probable that in the time of Moses there was but one language spoken from Goshen to Mount Seir, and that

such language was the Hebrew of our Bible. Dialects, however, there must have been; and as these dialects approached Damascus they were no doubt more or less affected by Aramaic influences. It has been often observed by Hebrew scholars that the language of Elihu, who was of the 'kindred of Ram' (Job 32. 2), is markedly distinguished from the language of the other interlocutors by the great number of Aramaisms it contains. Midian lay on the Elanitic Gulf, at the southern end of Mount Seir, and the Midianites must have preserved their Hebrew till the thirteenth century B.C., for when the Midianites invaded Israel and were encamped in the valley of Jezreel (Judges 6. 33), their converse with each other was readily understood by the Israelites who were listening to it (Judges 7. 11). At the same time the language spoken on the highlands of Ephraim was marked by a provincialism which at once distinguished the speakers from the other Israelites, as the men of Ephraim found to their cost (Judges 12. 6). There is nothing to lead us to the conclusion that the speech used on the coast differed essentially from the Hebrew. The language of the Phoenician inscriptions can only be considered as a Hebrew dialect.

The origin of the name Rutennu may, I think, be gathered from the account which Moses has left us of Asshur and his migrations (Gen. 10. 11). 'Out of that land (Shinar) went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah; the same is a great city.' The site of Resen has not yet been determined, but the manner in which it is mentioned by Moses justifies the conclusion that in his day it was a great capital—perhaps the greatest of the Assyrian cities. The interchange of a dental and a sibilant is so frequent in the Shemitic languages that we may reasonably consider Resen to be a mere variant of Ruten. Calah I am inclined to place somewhere between the Khabour and the Euphrates, in the district called Calakhēnē. Calakhēnē may have signified

the district of Calakh[1]. There was a place called Calah on the Tigris, some eighteen miles south of Nineveh, but I have vainly endeavoured to reconcile its locality and other circumstances connected with it with those that belong to the Calah of Genesis. Rehoboth perhaps lay on the site of the village called Rhewabeh [Rohébeh], near the junction of the Khabour and the Euphrates. There are mounds and other indicia of Assyrian antiquity in the neighbourhood.

The hieroglyphic inscriptions speak of the upper Rutennu and the lower Rutennu, and in one of his excavations at Thebes Mariette discovered a list of the towns taken from the Lower Rutennu by Thothmes III. The towns seem to have lain on both sides of the Jordan, and apparently in the same district as was attacked by Chedorlaomer in the time of Abraham (Gen. 14. 5). The country of the Upper Rutennu probably reached from that of the Lower Rutennu to the Tigris. I believe the two districts together formed the Asshur of Balaam's prophecy. The Tigris is described in Gen. 2. 14 as flowing through the east of the Asshur, and therefore Nineveh which lay upon it must have been situated on its very furthest border, as appears from the statement (Gen. 2. 14) that the Tigris (Hiddekel) goeth *toward the east* of Assyria. In later ages, when Nineveh had swallowed up many of the neighbouring states, its district was sometimes spoken of as if it constituted the whole of Assyria, and modern Egyptologists generally so regard it. There can be no doubt that the site of the Nineveh of Genesis lay among the ruins opposite to Mosul. It is the only city of Asshur mentioned in Scripture which can be now satisfactorily identified.

In the twelfth century B.C. Nineveh was rapidly bringing into subjection the whole of ancient Asshur. On the site of this great capital are found detached masses of ruin, which are generally supposed to represent what at one

[1] ēnē was one of the terminations employed by Greek geographers to denote Assyrian districts.

time were distinct cities. One of these, called Kouyunjik, lies opposite to Mosul, and appears from the inscriptions to have had the name of Nineveh specially applied to it. It was certainly the Nineveh of Gen. 10. 11, and must have given its name to the great city, in the circuit of whose walls it was afterwards inclosed. Some eighteen miles south is another huge ruin, called Nimroud. It appears to take the name of Calah in the inscriptions, but if, as would appear, Shalmaneser was the builder, this ruin can hardly represent the Calah of Genesis. Besides, there are no ruins between Nimroud and Kouyunjik which answer to Resen. Some of the later kings surrounded their palaces with formidable defences and made them what might be called the fortified quarters of their capital. These royal buildings must have served not only as residences for the monarch, his retainers and his guards, but also as armouries of the empire and depositories of the royal treasures and the national archives. Nineveh 'was an exceeding great city of three days' journey' (Jonah 3. 3); and Diodorus (2. 3), in perfect accordance with Scripture, gives it a circuit of some sixty miles. Jonah entered into it a day's journey before he began to unfold his tale of woe. It must have been a strange mixture of town and country, a vast area covered with pastures and orchards and gardens, with streets, temples, and palaces—such at least is the description that has been handed down to us of Babylon, and there can be little doubt that in these particulars Nineveh resembled it. The surrounding walls have not yet been satisfactorily traced; but Mr. Bonomi has ventured the conjecture that the long ridge known as the Gebel Mekloub may have been formed by the ruins of the eastern wall. The walls of Babylon, whose enormous height excited the wonder of Herodotus, have in like manner disappeared. When in later times the outer casing of burnt brick was carried away to furnish materials for the neighbouring villages, the inner core of sun-dried brick would soon be levelled with the ground by the rains. The substructures, on which the palaces were

built, did not generally exceed forty or fifty feet in height, and their vast lateral expansion secured them from sinking into utter ruin like the lofty attenuated structures which surrounded the city.

Between Balaam and Jonah six or seven centuries must have elapsed, and during that period dialects of the same language seem to have prevailed over the whole of the Shemitic area. Neither Balaam nor Jonah had any difficulty, apparently, at least as regards language, in conveying their messages to the people for whom they were intended. It seems that as early as the days of Jacob there were peculiarities of dialect (Gen. 31. 47); and scholars tell us that in the Book of Job the language of Elihu, who was of 'the kindred of Ram' (Job 32. 2), differs markedly from that of the other speakers; but the speakers were all intelligible to each other, and they seem to have represented all the tribes dwelling east of Mount Seir from Damascus to the Elanitic Gulf. The distinction between Asshur and Eber was known beyond the Shemitic area. M. Chabas (Mélanges Egyptiennes, Ser. 1. pp. 42–49) discovered three papyri—two belonging to the reign of Ramses II, and one to the reign of Ramses III,—which contained accounts of food, etc., provided for a people called Aperiu. They appear to have worked in the quarries, and to have dug stone for certain of the royal buildings. M. Chabas suggests that Aperiu was the Egyptian form of the name Ibrim, and that the accounts may have been made out by officers who had the superintendence of the Hebrews during the captivity, but no Pharaoh before the time of Shishak had war with Israel, or (as we may assume) Israelite prisoners in slavery. The two warlike Pharaohs we have mentioned assuredly had wars with some of the many races of Ibrim around them, and the prisoners they took from them were no doubt the Aperiu alluded to in the papyri.

During the 400 years' sojourn in Egypt the term Ibrim seems to have been used by the Israelites with some change of meaning. The Israelites were living in a strange land, a

solitary people beside a nation of foreigners, and the term Ibrim came to be applied in *popular* language to distinguish them from the native Egyptians around them. Moses, when he is dealing with matters of general history, gives to the terms Eber and Ibrim their old historical meaning, but gives them their popular meaning when dealing with matters specially relating to the Israelites. In times succeeding those in which the covenant was given, the term Ibrim seems to have been regarded with little favour, and the Israelites preferred as their national appellative the name of the later patriarch from whom they were descended. Jacob and Israel became thenceforward the cherished names the Jewish father handed down to his children.

There is a text which throws important light on the nature of the dialects spoken in Jerusalem in the eighth century B.C. When Rabshakeh summoned the city to surrender he was requested by Hezekiah's officers to 'speak in the Syrian language (Arammith); for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews' language (Yudith) in the ears of the people that are on the wall' (2 Kings, 18. 26). The Jews' language here referred to must have been the Hebrew of our Bibles, and at the time of Rabshakeh's visit, i.e. in the fifth century B.C., it must have been familiar to persons in every grade of society in Jerusalem. I should attribute this general prevalence of Hebrew at Jerusalem to the Temple services, or, perhaps we might add, to the readings in the synagogues. A dialect used for the religious services would naturally spread among a people; and the fact of Hebrew being the Jews' sacred language is, I think, a sufficient answer to a criticism which has been brought forward against the genuineness of our Scriptures. It has been asked whether a spoken language could have remained so little changed as we find in Scripture during the long period that elapsed between the time of Moses and that of the later prophets? If the Hebrew were stereotyped as a sacred language—as the language in which the Jew offered up his prayers and

formulated his religious creed, persistency of language was to be expected. We have other instances of persistency of language under similar circumstances. It is well known that the Arabic spoken at Damascus, Cairo, and other religious centres is very corrupt. When Palgrave worked his way to the Nedjid (Central Arabia), he was surprised to find there races enjoying a certain amount of civilization, and still more was he surprised to find all classes speaking pure Arabic. The reason was soon a patent one. The Empire of the Wahabis (Mahomedan Puritans) was widespread, and their influence diffused even beyond its limits. When there was a reading in the mosque public officials scoured the streets, and a smart castigation reminded the loitering Wahabi of his duty. The mosques were crowded, and all classes spoke good Arabic.

I think the Aramaic of Babylon, i.e. the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel, must have been partially known at Jerusalem as early as the seventh century B.C., for Jeremiah once uses it (ch. 10. 11), and he wrote for the people. I would say, therefore, that this was not the variety of Aramaic in which Rabshakeh was invited to speak. I have sometimes thought that the passage would convey the meaning of the original somewhat more correctly, if it were rendered—'speak *in your Aramaic*; for we understand it,' &c. The Jewish officers were addressing an Assyrian general, and they might reasonably ask him to use that variety of the Aramaic which was familiar to the Assyrians. When Jonah went on shipboard he made acquaintance, probably for the first time in his life—for he was country-bred—with a ship-captain, and he calls him rab-ha-hobel (Jonah 1. 6) the chief of the sailors. This form is, I believe, unknown to the Hebrew, but must have been common in the Assyrian; for we have rab-mag, &c. It was probably this Assyrian variety of Aramaic which was used by Jonah when he preached to the men of Nineveh (Jonah 3. 4), and on which he relied to work his way as far west as Tarshish. If this reasoning be sound, it will follow that the Aramaic

dialects on which, at a later age, were founded the 'Chaldee' and the 'Syriac,' had begun to show their distinctive peculiarities as early as the ninth century B.C. I do not think that the text Gen. 31. 47 will support the inference that has been sometimes drawn from it, viz. that in the lifetime of Jacob Hebrew and Aramaic were distinct languages, though it is possible that in the two families of Jacob and Laban little peculiarities of phrase may have showed themselves at an early period.

In Egyptian inscriptions of the nineteenth and twentieth dynasties mention is sometimes made of a district called *ta-neter* or the holy land. It is described in some of the inscriptions as lying north, and in others as lying east of Egypt. Brugsch (Geogr. Inschr. 2. 17) would identify it with Palestine, but De Rougé (Rev. Arch. 1861, 2nd part, 216) locates it in the northern desert, towards the head of the Persian Gulf. From it were brought gold, silver, precious stones, a certain kind of precious wood, aromatic substances, and a kind of gum. Many of these are products of southern Arabia, and might be carried coastwise either to the Elanitic Gulf or to the Euphrates. In either case they would fall in with the stream of traffic running westward from the southern Euphrates. The country over which this traffic passed—in other words, the desert stretching 'from Havilah to Shur, which is over against Egypt'—was, I think, most probably the *ta-neter* referred to in the inscriptions.

The peculiar sanctity of this district is implied in the language used by Moses (Exod. 5. 1). 'Thus saith Jehovah God of Israel, Let My people go, that they may hold a feast unto Me *in the wilderness*. And Pharaoh said, who is Jehovah, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, neither will I let Israel go. And they said, the God of the Ibrim hath met with us. Let us go, we pray thee, three days' journey into *the desert*, to sacrifice unto Jehovah our God; lest,' &c. Here Moses drops the

name of the Covenant-God, and uses the phrase 'God of the Ibrim' to explain to Pharaoh their wish to sacrifice in the district so sacred to the Ibrim. By keeping in mind the sacred character of this district we may also understand certain expressions which occur in the song of triumph sung by Moses after the passage of the Red Sea (Ex. 15. 13): 'Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people which Thou hast redeemed: Thou hast guided them in Thy strength *unto Thy holy habitation.* The people shall hear and be afraid: sorrow shall take hold of the inhabitants of Palestina. Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed, the mighty men of Moab, trembling shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away.' Various have been the attempts made to explain the words 'Thy holy habitation,' but all are more or less unsatisfactory. If we suppose the *ta-neter* to be the desert stretching from Havilah to Shur, and including probably the adjacent districts, then we have at least a plausible explanation. Moses was standing at the entrance of that land whither he had asked to go to do sacrifice to his God. It was probably the district wherein the last of the great patriarchs had been held in special honour, and which was still hallowed by the sanctity this priest of the most high God had given to it.

The reader will perhaps have anticipated me in identifying Eber with him that prefigured the 'Forerunner'—in other words, with the great patriarch whom Abraham found in Canaan when *he* also passed over and earned the title of Ibri (Gen. 14. 13). The name Melchizedek points at once to the character of him that bore it—the Melek, or king of righteousness, the priest that offered sacrifices and made atonement for the sins of his people. It was this venerable man that blessed Abraham when returning from the slaughter of the kings, and 'without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.' But in that distant country the emigrant whom the Apostle thus ranks above Abraham was living among strangers, removed from his native land and his father's house. Unlike the Levitical priests of later

times, whose descent could be traced step by step from Aaron, this greater priest was 'without father, without mother, without pedigree.' The tribes around him knew neither the date nor the place of his birth, 'he had no beginning of days,' and generation after generation passed away and still the aged man was found at his post of duty, of all the postdiluvians, he that lingered longest upon earth, of whom as of his great antitype, it might be said, 'he abideth a priest continually.'

Jerome tells us (in Esai. c. 41) that the Hebrews considered Melchizedek to be Shem; Epiphanius (Adv. Hær. 2. 1), that the Samaritans thought him to be Shem, or according to some MSS., the son of Shem. Epiphanius also informs us (ib.) there were people who declared that his father was named Heraklas, and his mother Ashteroth or Asteria; and according to an Arabic Catena (c. 31. fol. 61 a) quoted by a learned Oxonian[1] of the seventeenth century, his father was Heraclim son of Phaleg, son of Eber, &c., and his mother Salathiel, daughter of Gomer. Want of space will not allow me to dwell longer on these monkish legends. It will be sufficient to observe that they point to a supposed connexion between Melchizedek (Eber) and the Heracleidæ who figure so largely in Greek history. Whence the Heracleidæ came may be the subject of future discussion.

[1] Vide Works of John Gregory, ed. 1671; To the Reader, sign. a. 2.

CHAPTER V.

CANAAN the earliest trader; settled first on the southern Euphrates; migrated thence to the coasts of the Mediterranean. — Etymology of the name Canaan.—Speculations of Gesenius and his followers.—The etymology of these early names very uncertain.—Canaan may originally have signified a trader.—Noah's curse on him.

Connexion of Canaanites with Egypt.—The Rebu.—The Cuthim.—Distinction of colour. — Mixed races.—Cuth and Heth. — Canaanitish settlements on the Mediterranean.

THERE was another emigrant from the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, round whose name has gathered an amount of interest, second only to that which surrounds the name of Eber. He figures in general history as the Phoenician, but is known in Scripture for the most part by the name of Canaan. His descendants long cherished a recollection of their eastern origin, and for some 2000 years, if we may trust our classical authorities, regarded the districts bordering on the great river as their mother country.

That such international relations should continue to exist between two distant races for so long a period is not what our own experience would lead us to expect. Our emigrants to America or Australia seem to look upon Britain as a foreign country, before the second generation has well passed away. But Justin's statements are clear, and consistent with each other, and not inconsistent with such hints as are met with in Scripture relating to the subject.

We are told in Gen. 10. 15 that Canaan begat Sidon his firstborn; thence we must infer, that the earliest Canaanitish settlements were on the Mediterranean. According to Justin (18. 3), Sidon took its name from its fishery[1], and Gesenius suggests the word *tsud*, to snare (fish), as the root whence the name was derived. The mollusc producing the

[1] The name reminds us of Bethsaida, the fisher-town so often mentioned in the Gospels.

purple dye so highly prized by the ancients, is found on the whole line of coast, and towns would of course be wanted for the accommodation of the fishermen. The whole adjacent coast seems to have been known to the Greeks by the name of Sidonia (Od. 13. 285)—that is, the fisheries. Tyre no doubt took its name from the rock (tsur) which lay opposite to it and formed its harbour. At a later period the rock was built upon by refugees from Sidon (Justin 18. 3) and the town so built was called New Tyre. Herodotus, when travelling in Egypt about the year 450 B.C., investigated the history of the Egyptian Hercules, and was informed that his most venerated temple was in Tyre (Herod. 2. 44). To Tyre therefore Herodotus went, and was told that the temple was coeval with the city[1] and had existed 2300 years. According to this computation, Tyre must have been founded some 2700 years B.C.

According to the passage we have quoted from Justin (18. 3) the Phoenicians were alarmed by earthquakes, and dwelt first on the Assyrian lake (stagnum) and afterwards on the sea coast. Hence we are led to infer that they retreated from Shinar to the lagoons on the southern Euphrates, and then crossed the desert to Canaan. The Phoenicians, according to Herodotus (1. 1; 7. 89), first dwelt on the Erythrean Sea, by which he means the Persian Gulf; and this legend was probably floating in the mind of Pliny when he wrote that king Erythra first invented rafts 'in mari rubro' (7. 57). In the Persian Gulf were two islands, Tyrus and Aradus. They contained temples built after the Phoenician manner, and the inhabitants pretended that the Tyrus and Aradus in the Mediterranean were their colonies (Strabo, 16. 3. 4, p. 766). As the Tyrus in the Mediterranean certainly took its name from the rock (tsur) which lay before it and formed its harbour, it must have been the original Tyre. The Tyrus and Aradus in

[1] That is, with Old Tyre, for it was in Old Tyre that the temple stood (Justin, 11. 10). New Tyre on the rock was not built till a later period (Ib. 18. 3); according to Josephus (Ant. 8. 3) some 240 years before Solomon's temple.

the Persian Gulf were probably factories established in the time of Solomon (1 Kings 10. 22) and named by his Phoenician seamen after the Mediterranean towns whence they came. After the lapse of some thousand years, the mistake alluded to in Strabo might easily have arisen. Confusion between an emigrant people and the mother-race is constantly occurring in early history, and has often led the historian into error.

Etymology has not unfrequently misled the speculator when tracing the history of the early Phoenicians, and some of the ablest of our scholars have forwarded the mischief. Gesenius supposed that Canaan originally signified a low land, and only in a secondary sense a trader; the lowlanders having been generally engaged in traffic. The term *milliner* may perhaps furnish us with a case not unlike the one he has suggested. It is said that *milliner* properly meant a native of Milan, and only secondarily a person who followed the occupation once characteristic of that town. Some followers of Gesenius suppose that Canaan was a name given to the low-lying trading district of Tyre and Sidon, in contradistinction to the heights of the neighbouring Lebanon; others, that the name of Canaan distinguished the valley of the Jordan from the mountains of the Amorite (Numb. 13. 29); while another party maintain that the name of Canaan was given generally to the low-lying districts of Palestine, as distinguished from the high table-land that stretched thence to the Euphrates. Every one, I think, must feel how unsatisfactory are these conclusions. Amid such a heap of inconsistent guesses, we may not be ashamed to bring forward a conjecture of our own.

I cannot help thinking that the etymology which on the authority of Gesenius has obtained so general an acceptance, is an erroneous one. The root from which this scholar deduced his meaning of a lowland, would, I think, just as readily have given him that of a trader or, to speak with more precision, a packman, one that carried

about his bales for traffic. The supposed secondary meaning was, I believe, the primary one. The valleys of the Orontes and the Jordan, the plain of Esdraelon, and the coast-line at the foot of Lebanon, must always have been among the main lines of traffic in Syria; and it is chiefly in connexion with these localities that we find mention made of the Canaanite. The spies sent by Moses (Numb. 13. 29) found the Canaanite by the sea, and by the side of Jordan, and Isaiah asks (23. 8) 'who hath taken this counsel against Tyre, the crowning city, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers' (in the original, 'whose Canaanites') 'are the honourable of the earth,' &c. It is obvious how readily this appellative might under the circumstances become a national name. St. Augustine tells us that if the peasants in the neighbourhood of Carthage were asked what people they were, they would, in reference to their mother-country, answer Canaanites. Of the tribal names mentioned in Genesis 10. 15–18, the only one which apparently belongs to a patriarchal ancestor is that of Heth. We read of the children of Heth, the sons of Heth, and the daughters of Heth, but never of the children of Sidon, the sons of Sidon, &c. Heth appears to have been the name which at the time of the Exodus the Canaanites commonly used to indicate their countrymen; and in Joshua 1. 4 the phrase, 'all the land of the Hittites,' is used to denote the promised land. But the etymology of the Canaanitish races mentioned in Genesis 10 opens up questions of great difficulty, and requires to be studied from different points of view.

The Canaanite, or trader, seems to have visited the country, which from him took the name of Canaan, not very long after the Deluge, and during the lives of some of the patriarchs who had witnessed that event. This inference follows naturally from the relation of the circumstances which led to Noah's curse on Ham, that is, supposing our etymology of the name of Canaan to be the true one. It is not easy at first sight to say why of all Ham's descendants

Canaan should be selected to bear the punishment his father's irreverence had provoked. The 'trader' was the youngest, and therefore may have been the favourite son of his father; and of all the sons of Ham, it was he whose descendants pushed their settlements nearest to the district which Noah and the three patriarchs had made their home. The allusion to him was therefore not an unnatural one. The prophet probably foresaw that of all Ham's descendants the Canaanites would come most frequently into contact with the children of Shem and Japheth, and he foretold that by each of these races they would sooner or later be humbled and subdued; 'a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.'

From the frequent reference in Scripture to the district of 'Tyre and Sidon,' it is clear that this portion of the Phoinician coast had in an especial manner fixed the attention of the Jews. The reason was evidently because these towns were the ports through which passed the commerce of Damascus to the western world without. The stream of commerce which passed from the Euphrates *south* of Palestine must have found an outlet at a more southern port, no doubt at Rhinocorura, the site of which certainly lay near the modern El Arish. My opinion as to the people who occupied this portion of Phoenicia differs so widely from that generally entertained by our Egyptologists, that I must venture to dwell with some little particularity on their history.

In the hieroglyphic inscriptions mention is often made of a people called the Rebu. They are recognized in the Egyptian pictures by the mystical lock, and by being generally mixed up with Egyptians as allies or enemies [1].

[1] [For the further treatment of the Rebu, who appear here in connexion with a fragmentary argument, see below, pp. 191, 196-199.] It is probable that the author at one time intended to follow up, in this place, his inquiry into the history of the Ereb of Rhinocorura; but afterwards determined to take it in what seemed a more natural connexion with the races discussed in the seventh chapter.

When the Assyrians re-peopled Samaria in the eighth century B.C., a portion of the transplanted races came from Cuth or Cutha. They worshipped (2 Kings 17. 30) Nergal, generally supposed to be the man-lion, whose presence, half human, half animal, the Assyrian sculptures have made familiar to us. Some fifteen or sixteen miles east of Babylon are certain ruins, and it is said the name of Cutha has been found impressed on bricks dug up there. This site has accordingly been selected as that of Cutha. The bitter jealousies that sprung up between the foreign immigrants into Palestine and the native inhabitants are well known. The Jew acknowledged no kinship with the Samaritans. He treated them as mere strangers, and called them Cuthim, or in the Hellenistic phrase of Josephus (Ant. 14. 3) Khouthaioi.

In the time of the Maccabees Shechem was the capital of the district thus repeopled. Its inhabitants, according to Josephus (Ant. 11. 8. 6), called themselves the Sidonians of Shechem, and appealed to their state records to show their descent from the Sidonians (Ant. 12. 5. 5). As Josephus must have been well acquainted both with the Scriptures and with the opinion the Jews, his countrymen, entertained of these strangers, I conclude that he and the Jews of the Dispersion gave to the term Sidonioi a wider range of meaning than its history warranted. The adoption of the name Rhegines, literally the men of Rhagae, to indicate the Medes (Jos. Ant. 1. 6. 1), furnishes us with a parallel case.

That the later Jews *did* confound the Sidonians with the Cuthim might perhaps be inferred from the name Cuthanias, which seems to be connected with Cutha, which in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is given as a name to Sidon (Gen. 10).

The name Philistine (in Hebrew Peleshtim) is, for the most part, found in Scripture in connexion with races who dwelt on the southern part of the Phoenician coast. It first appears in the account of Abraham's dealings with Abime-

lech, king of Gerar, a district generally supposed to have lain south of Gaza. Hebrew scholars seem to be generally agreed that this term Philistine originally meant emigrants. The writers of the Septuagint rendered it by the Greek word *Allophuloi*, or foreigners.

The hieroglyphic name Pulusata, and perhaps the name Philitis, which according to Herodotus (2. 128) was given by the Egyptians to 'the Shepherd' who built the pyramids, may possibly have been suggested by this name Peleshtim.

We gather from their monuments that the Egyptians looked upon the races living around them as divided mainly into three groups—the white, the red, and the black men. The black men were Negroes, Ethiopians, &c.; the red men were Egyptians, certain tribes living on the southern coast of Arabia, and other tribes living on the shores of the Mediterranean; the white or yellow men chiefly represented Asiatic tribes living to the north-east of Egypt. These distinctions may not be invariably observed, and we sometimes find a difference of colour employed to distinguish the sexes. The classification of peoples according to their colour was evidently a rude attempt at an ethnography which, to carry out successfully, required a knowledge beyond the reach of these early races. It appealed however directly to the senses, and was of easy application; and accordingly for thousands of years it was the mode by which the popular mind distinguished the great families of mankind.

The terms Eruthraioi and Phoinikes alike signify the red men. The first term seems to have been used by the Greeks to denote specially the red men that dwelt in southern Arabia, but to have been used occasionally as a general name for the whole of the copper-coloured races. The term Phoinikes had a more restricted meaning than Eruthraioi. Dionysius Periegetes (906) speaks of the

> 'Phoinikes
> Of the race of those men who are called Eruthraioi.'

The mythologists record the name of a king Eruthraios (Dion.

Perieg. 607) who is represented as having reigned in southern Arabia. The sea washing the shores of the Persian Gulf and of southern Arabia was known as the Eruthraian (Herod. 4. 39), and there can be little doubt took its name from the supposed colour of the men who lived in those districts, and who were reigned over by this mythical king Eruthraios. The name Eruthraian came gradually to signify that portion of the sea encircling Arabia which was best known to Europeans, and the western arm of that sea is still known as the Red Sea. The Wahabees of northern Arabia look on their southern neighbours as one of the darker races, and, owing either to their original descent or to a mixture of African blood, these southern Arabs are said to be of a perceptibly darker hue than the Arabs in the north of the peninsula. This difference of colour seems to be recognized as indicating a distinction of race. A recent traveller tells us that if one of a crowd of Arab boys were to pluck a red flower, another would pluck a white, and the two parties would be soon ranged against each other in fierce antagonism.

The passage from Dionysius Periegetes (p. 153) giving to the Phoinikes a place among the races called Eruthraioi is consistent with the teaching of the ancient geographers. Pliny, as we have seen, tells us (7. 57) that in the earliest ages rafts were invented by king Erythra 'in mari rubro.' Here there seems to be a reference to the Phoenicians while occupying their earliest settlements among the lagoons on the lower Euphrates, before they passed westward to the Mediterranean. Again, on the eastern coast of the Ægean Sea, on what was called the Eruthraian peninsula, was a town called Eruthrai. It was said to have been founded by Eruthros son of Rhadamanthus (Paus. 7. 3. 4), and originally peopled by Cretans, Lycians, Carians, and Pamphylians, though it afterwards came into possession of the Ionians. According to Pausanias (7. 5. 3; 9. 27. 5) this town contained a very ancient temple dedicated to Heraklēs, of the Idaei Dactyli, whom the Tyrians also worshipped.

Now Strabo (13. 1. 64, p. 613) tells us the Eruthraioi[1] worshipped Heraklēs surnamed Ipoktonos, or the ips-slayer, the *ips* being a fly that was very destructive to the vines. There can be little doubt that this Heraklēs Ipoktonos was the Baal-zebub or Fly-Baal, the god of Ekron, whom the apostate king of Israel wished to consult as he was lying on his death-bed (2 Kings 1. 2). According to the passage in Pausanias we have referred to, this idol was also worshipped at Tyre. The Cretans, who first settled in Eruthrai, came in all probability from the Cretan town of Eruthraia, which lay near the promontory called Eruthraion, and which, under the circumstances, I think we may conclude was a Phoenician[2] colony.

The name Phoinikes has been derived from Phoinos, red. We are not able to say that the Hellenic or classical Greeks ever called the Phoenicians Phoin-oi or red men, but the name may have been in use among the cognate races, and from it the Latins may have got the name of Poeni, which the Romans gave to the Carthaginians—the great Phoenician people with whom they warred so long for the mastery of the world. There is however a difficulty in the way of these conclusions. The Hittites and Amorites, though in Gen. 10 ranged as sons of Ham with the men of Sidon, are always represented in Egyptian pictures as white or yellow and not as red men. Indeed there is no people who are represented in Scripture as settled in Palestine whom we can on the authority of the Egyptian pictures pronounce to be red men, excepting the Cherethites, and these were probably not introduced into Palestine before the time of Joshua. But mixed races were not uncommon in these early times. The Rutennu, who are generally supposed to have been an Assyrian people, are depicted some as white and others as red men, and it is

[1] He calls them Eruthraioi who inhabit Melious. Melious is generally supposed to be a corruption of Mimas, the name of the mountain range which traversed the peninsula of Eruthrai.

[2] Diodorus (5. 79) makes Eruthros successor to Rhadamanthus.

not unlikely that the Cuthites who founded Sidon, and who are said to have come from the Euphrates, were red men, while the bulk of the people in that city were Hittites. The duplicity of phrase, Cuth and Heth, is reflected in the Greek terms Kudōnes and Kitioi. The traders from Cutha may have worked their way to the Mediterranean at a very early period, and owing to their superior civilization gained an ascendency over the white races in their neighbourhood. The natives brought under their influence would naturally settle round the Cuthite factories, and thus may have been founded the Canaanitish or trading towns of Sidon, Tyre, &c.; just as Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay grew round the great centres of English trade in India. As the country became more densely peopled, the tribes which had consorted with and taken a name from these foreign traders, would require more space for their growing numbers, and thus the families of the Canaanites were 'spread abroad' (Gen. 10. 18). Some of these tribes acquired a new name from the locality they settled in, or the new occupation they followed, as the Amorite from his mountain, the Hivite from his villages, the Jebusite from the stronghold of Jebus, &c. These Shemitic tribes seem to have been called 'sons of Ham' (Gen. 10. 20) by the same licence of language according to which certain Midianites were called Ishmaelites (vide p. 138), or, to take a modern instance, just as the Americanized negroes of Liberia are called 'the whites' by the negro races in their neighbourhood.

These conclusions differ from generally received opinion; but I do not readily see how they can be avoided, unless we hold that some of Ham's descendants were white men. This is possible, but it is opposed to what I believe has hitherto been the general opinion held on the subject[1].

[1] [The arrangement of the last few pages is that adopted by the author in his last revision; but it is clear, from the recurrence to the Phoenicians in the later chapters, that the final readjustment of matter and argument was not completed.]

CHAPTER VI.

TERAH's three sons, Abraham, Nahor, Haran. — Terah passes to Haran on his route to Canaan ; came from 'Ur of the Chaldees'; Ur situate in Armenia. — Abraham proceeds to Egypt; was settled among the Amorites at Hebron when Chedorlaomer invaded Palestine. — Abraham and his Amorite confederates followed the invaders in their retreat to Damascus, and by a night surprise inflicted on them a terrible defeat.—Ur of the Chaldees.—Northern and Southern Chaldees.—The Chaldees of the time of Job.—Schools of the Chaldees at Orkhoe and Borsippa.

The Ishmaelites.—Paramount importance of the fortunes of Israel.—The fate of the Edomites.

TERAH, the seventh in descent from Arphaxad, had three sons, Abraham, Nahor, and Haran (Gen. 11. 26). Haran was ancestor of the children of Lot, or in other words, of the Moabites and Ammonites; Nahor was ancestor of the Chaldees, or, to give them their Hebrew title, of the Khasdim; and in the other son, Abraham, we recognize one of the greatest of the Old Testament patriarchs.

The father of Abraham went forth with his family from 'Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came unto Haran and dwelt there' (Gen. 11. 31). It is generally agreed that Haran was the Karrhai of Ptolemy, which lay between the Khabour and the Euphrates, in the district which the Jews called Padan-aram (Gen. 25. 20). As Canaan was situate to the south-west of Haran we might naturally suppose that Ur lay somewhere to the north-east. Now in this direction, in the highlands drained by the eastern arm of the Euphrates, was a place called Ur (Amm. Marc. 25. 7, 8), and in its neighbourhood were settled the Khalubes[1] of Xenophon, who, as Strabo tells us

[1] The Chalybes of the Euxine were the great metallurgists of antiquity, and from them the art of steel manufacture may have migrated with the Iberes into Spain. The Bilbilis (Salo or Xalon) and the Chalybs were the rivers whose waters were most in repute among the steel-forgers of that country, Justin 44. 3. 8, and Pliny 34. 41.

(12. 3. 19, p. 549), were the same people as the Khaldaioi. Here, then, we have an Ur situated just where we might expect to find it, and as it has Chaldees in its neighbourhood, it seems to answer all the requirements which in Scripture are connected with the name 'Ur of the Chaldees.'

When seventy-five years old (Gen. 12. 4) Abraham was ordered to leave Haran and proceed on his way to Canaan: he took with him Lot his brother Haran's son, but left Nahor and the rest of his father's family behind him in Padan-aram. Intercourse between the two emigrants and the parent-stock appears to have been thenceforward casual and unfrequent, but it did not altogether cease. We read in Genesis (22. 20) 'It was told Abraham, saying, behold Milcah, she hath also born children unto thy brother Nahor; Huz his firstborn, and Buz his brother, and Kemuel the father of Aram, and Chesed, and Hazo, and Pildash, and Jidlaph, and Bethuel. And Bethuel begat Rebekah, &c. And his concubine, whose name was Reumah, she bare also Tebah, and Gaham, and Thahash, and Maachah.' Bethuel, the youngest son of Milcah, remained at Haran, his father's town, which it is said long retained traces of its Chaldean settlers (Assemani, Bibl. Orien. 1. 327). Nahor's eldest sons were probably sent into the world by their father, much in the same way as the sons of the concubines were sent forth by Abraham (Gen. 25. 6). Some of these sons seem to have gone southwards in search of settlements, and according to the system of interpretation which I believe to be very generally applicable to the geography of Scripture, I gather from the passage quoted, that Nahorite families settled north and west of Gilead in Huz and Buz (Job 32. 2) and Maachah, and in other districts neighbouring on Damascus, which latter place specially took the name of Aram. Maachah I take to be the Aram-Maachah whence the Ammonites obtained aid in their wars with David (1 Chron. 19. 6), and the Tibhath (1 Chron. 18. 8) which David plundered may possibly have given a name to Tebah.

Gesenius has suggested that the first element of Arphaxad

(Arpha-ksad) was the Arabic *urfat*, a limit, a boundary; so that, according to the character we assign to the compound, Arphaxad might signify either the Border of Khesed, or Khesed of the Border. Khesed is a well-known Shemitic name, so that on the first supposition Arphaxad would be a district personified, on the second a title of the patriarch derived from the place he lived in. This etymology has the merit of explaining the name of Khasdim, the people of Khesed, or Arphaxad, thus agreeing with Josephus, who tells us that the descendants of Arphaxad were named after him. It locates also the district of Arphaxad to the north of Assyria, where it would seem the sequence Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad (Gen. 10. 22), and the requirements of Greek geography [1] agree in fixing it.

After his arrival in Canaan a famine arose in the land, which compelled Abraham to go down into Egypt. On his return to Canaan he took up his abode near Bethel, in a position overlooking the Jordan valley, which was shortly to become the scene of the earliest military expedition of which any trustworthy accounts have reached us. 'It came to pass in the days of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of nations (Goim); that these made war with Bera king of Sodom, and with Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela, which is Zoar. All these were joined together in the vale of Siddim, which is the salt sea. Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer, and in the thirteenth year they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the Rephaims in Ashteroth Karnaim, and the Zuzims in Ham, and the Emims in Shaveh Kiriathaim, and the Horites in their mount Seir, unto El-paran, which is by the wilderness. And they returned, and came to

[1] According to Josephus (Ant. I. 7), Nicolas of Damascus represented the land of the Chaldees, whence Abraham came, as lying above (*huper*) Babylon.

En-mishpat, which is Kadesh, and smote all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar' (Gen. 14). The mention of the Rephaim, the Emim, and the Horites, and of Seir, Ham, and El-paran, show us clearly enough that the invaders entered Palestine from the north, and descended to the salt sea by the east of Jordan; and just as clearly can we trace their return homeward by the route west of the river through the countries of the Amalekites and the Amorites. At Hebron and its neighbourhood Abraham was pasturing his cattle, in confederacy with three Amorite chiefs, when tidings reached him that his kinsman Lot was among the prisoners carried off by Chedorlaomer. In company with his three allies he pursued the enemy to Dan, and there by a night surprise utterly defeated them. From Dan he chased them 'to Hobah, which is on the left hand of Damascus.' As I believe the consequences of this defeat have been greatly underrated, I would dwell a little on some of the circumstances that attended it.

Abraham took with him 318 of his 'trained servants, born in his own house' (Gen. 14. 14). If his Amorite friends had each of them an equal following, the pursuers may have numbered a thousand men. The surprise must have been like that of the Amalekites when David overtook them (1 Sam. 30. 16); and when we remember that it was by night, and that the invaders were carrying off the inhabitants of the country, we may readily understand the panic that ensued, and the character of the flight from Dan to Hobah. The captives, no doubt, rose upon their captors, and repaid with interest the injuries they were smarting under. At Damascus Abraham was in the midst of his Nahorite or Chaldee kinsmen, men, who if we may judge of them from their later history, were by no means indisposed to follow any opening that led, or promised to lead, to plunder. The states rising into importance in the basin of the Euphrates, must have lost the flower of their youth in the invasion of Palestine, and were no doubt prostrated

by so terrible a calamity. The Chaldees seem to have taken advantage of their weakness.

West of the southern Euphrates are certain ruins called Mugheir. From an inscription found in these ruins it would appear that their ancient name was Ur. The place was called Chaldaeopolis by certain Greek writers[1], and it lies in the district generally assigned to the southern Chaldees. Mugheir was accordingly early fixed upon as the 'Ur of the Chaldees'; and several of our modern antiquaries have adopted this notion. But the difficulties that attend it appear to me insuperable. We must suppose that Abraham and his friends carried their flocks and herds over the southern Euphrates, and then up the river to Haran, merely, as it would seem, to cross it a second time on their road to Canaan. I do not know any satisfactory answer that has been, or can be, given to the objection here suggested. That the ruins at Mugheir were the work of Chaldees I have no doubt, but they must have been Chaldees coming from Damascus, not the more ancient Chaldees that came from the land where Arphaxad settled. Their connexion with Damascus explains the origin of the opinion so widely prevalent in the East, that Abraham once reigned in that city.

Ur was probably a variant form of the Hebrew *'îr*, a city, selected as the name of their capital alike by the southern and by the northern Chaldees. Ptolemy mentions Arrhapa as the name of a town bordering on Assyria; and the river running along the northern border of Armenia, and separating it from Russian territory, is called Erpay. It is not improbable that both Arrhapa and Erpay may be connected with the Arabic word *erput* [*urufath*], and signify respectively the city of the border-land, the boundary river. Ptolemy mentions a district named

[1] According to Eusebius (Praep. Evan. 9. 17), Alexander Polyhistor quoted Eupolemus as his authority for saying that Abraham was born at Camarina, a city of Babylon which was called Uriē, but by the Greeks Chaldaeopolis.

Arrapakhitis, in which Bochart would recognize the name Arphaxad; but *-itis* is a well-known Greek termination of district names in the basin of the Euphrates; and as from Arbela came Arbelitis, the district of Arbela, so from Arrhapa may have come Arrapakhitis, the district of Arrhapa, the final guttural being dropt in Arrhapa to assimilate the pronunciation to Greek usage.

The Assyrian *s*, when it comes before a dental, was generally pronounced as an *l*. We thus see the connexion between the Hebrew name Khasd-im and the Assyrian Khald-i. The latter gave rise to our English name Chaldee.

The northern Chaldees are chiefly known to us from the Anabasis of Xenophon. He generally calls them Khalubes, but when negotiating with the men of Sinope (5. 5. 17) he terms them Khaldaioi, and Strabo (12. 3. 19, p. 549) expressly identifies the two races. The mercenaries in the Persian service who opposed the Ten Thousand in their march from the Kurdish mountains, and more particularly at the passage of the Phasis, consisted chiefly of Khalubes and Taokhoi. The former, according to Xenophon, were the bravest of all the tribes through whose country he passed, and they even dared to meet the Greeks in hand-to-hand conflict (Anab. 4. 7. 6). They had on a linen thorax reaching to the belly, with tags (*pterugia*) of twisted cord, greaves and helmet, and at the belt a *makhairion*, like the Laconian dagger. With this they cut off the heads of their enemies, and carried them off singing and dancing. They had also a spear, said to be fifteen cubits long. There appear to have been several tribes of this people, for there were Khalubes on the coast; and Herodotus (1. 28) locates Khalubes even west of the Halys, apparently between the Mariandunoi and the Paphlagones. Whether the Halizones of the Iliad were Khaldaioi is discussed by Strabo (2. 3. 23, p. 550).

The southern Chaldees seem to have early risen into importance very soon after their settlement on the Euphrates.

The signet of one of their kings was found some years back, and, though it has strangely disappeared, a copy of it has luckily been preserved. The name of the king is represented by two symbols. The phonetic value of the first is well known, but that of the second is uncertain. Some Assyriologists would read the name Urukh, while others prefer the reading Ur-kham, and so identify it with the Orchamus of Ovid,

> Orchamus isque
> Septimus, etc.

The owner of the signet calls himself King of Ur, King of Accad and Sumir, and King of the four languages. The scholar that shall satisfactorily inform us what is meant by 'the four languages' will put the student of history under deep obligation[1]. 'King of Accad and Sumir' was a title assumed by many of the kings that reigned at a subsequent period in the basin of the Euphrates, and shows that Urukh must have possessed a kingdom of no small extent or importance.

In the ninth century B.C., Assur-bani-pal, more generally known as Sardanapalus, conquered Elam. He boasts that he restored to her ancient seat the goddess Nana, whom the men of Elam had carried off from Erech 1635 years before. It would seem therefore that as early as the twenty-third century B.C. the Elamites were making conquests on the southern Euphrates, and it was then no doubt they gained the ascendancy that enabled Chedorlaomer to lead the confederate kings to the invasion of Palestine. When that invasion ended disastrously, the Nahorite Chaldees seem to have established themselves at Mugheir, and under their king Urukh, if that be the name, to have attained a dominion which reminds us of the later Babylonian kingdoms. At a later period, perhaps about 1700 B.C., as Mr. George Smith conjectures, there appears in the inscriptions the name of a powerful king—Hummarabi king of the Kassi. In him I am inclined to recognize a king of the Kossaioi,

[1] [These points are again discussed in Chap. X.]

M 2

i.e. of the Cush mentioned in Gen. 10. 6, and a countryman of the celebrated Memnon, who figures dimly yet grandly in Greek legend.

In the days of Job (1. 17) the Chaldees are represented as carrying off his camels from the land of Uz, Sheba, or, as our version renders it, the Sabeans having previously carried off his asses and oxen. Job probably flourished not long before the year 1500 B.C., and Uz, there can be little doubt, lay somewhere to the north-east of Mount Seir. At this time therefore some of the Chaldean tribes dwelling in the northern desert could have been little better than marauding Bedawins. The Chaldees of Mugheir were no doubt a settled people and comparatively civilized, though they must have lost the supremacy they enjoyed under Urukh and his immediate successors. It appears from the inscriptions that there were several tribes of Chaldees, though none of them were of much importance, and when Isaiah (23. 13) in the eighth century foretold the fall of Tyre, he taunted the doomed city with the mean extraction of those who were to be its conquerors, 'Behold the land of the Chaldeans. This people was not till the Assyrians founded it for them that dwelt in the wilderness,' and I would draw the conclusion, that after the Assyrian conquests in the seventh century, some Assyrian king or viceroy transferred certain Chaldee tribes from the west of the Euphrates to Babylon, and that it was from the fort of vantage thus yielded to them, that the Chaldees subsequently turned upon their masters, and with the aid of the Medes robbed them of their empire.

The position of Daniel at Babylon was a very peculiar one. He was minister of a prince reigning over a people generally supposed to be not very advanced in civilization. This Daniel was made 'master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers' (Dan. 5. 11). Here the 'Chaldeans' are represented as a sect possessing gifts that raised them above the level of the community. Classical antiquity assigns to them the like character. It is clear therefore

that at Babylon there were men who had special gifts and who took the name of Chaldeans in a peculiar sense.

Strabo tells us (16. 1. 6. p. 739) that there were two schools of learning in Chaldea, one at Orchoē and the other at Borsippa. Orchoē, it is generally acknowledged, was Warka near Mugheir (Ur); and Borsippa, it is almost as generally agreed, was the Birs Nimroud, which neighboured upon, if it was not actually included within, the walls of Babylon. This stupendous ruin was, with the exception perhaps of its basement story, the work of Nebuchadnezzar, for his name is found inscribed upon the bricks composing it. It was erected, according to M. Oppert, on the foundation of the Great Tower (Babel). Orchoē was undoubtedly the Erech which, together with Accad and Babel, figures among the most ancient cities of Babylonia (Gen. 10. 10). When Sardanapalus was collecting his great library at Nineveh, it was from Orchoē he sent his servants to procure the most ancient and the most valued of his literary treasures. The school established at Orchoē must have been of the most remote antiquity. The Assyrian translations which accompanied many of the venerable relics exhumed at Nineveh enabled our scholars in some measure to recover from oblivion the most ancient of the Babylonian languages. Dr. Hincks, who first directed attention to this language, called it the Accadian. Orchoē was the great centre of Accadian learning, and the Chaldees who established themselves at Mugheir (Ur) must have extended to Orchoē (Erech) the protection which centuries afterwards it received from the kings of Nineveh. In the time of Daniel it was probably looked upon as the great seat of the ancient learning, and the Chaldees, on whom it was mainly dependent.

Berosus professed to have got the materials of his history from the archives of the temple of Belus. If the temple of Belus was built as late as the time of Nebuchadnezzar, its archives must have been of comparatively late date in the days of Berosus, and therefore could claim no deference on

the ground of their antiquity. They consisted probably of genealogical tables collected from various quarters; and their contents, we may conjecture, were arranged by Berosus according to the best judgment he could bring to bear upon the subject. We know there was extant at Babylon at least one chronological tablet of some antiquity, and of this Berosus no doubt availed himself, but for the period before the year 1000 B.C. his history seems to have been nothing more than a medley of disjointed fragments[1]. At a time when, according to Bible narrative and Assyrian record, the Elamites were dominating on the Euphrates, we hear of a *dynasty of Medes*. Such a dynasty may have reigned east of Mount Zagros a thousand years later, but it was probably never heard of on the plains of the Euphrates till after the fall of Nineveh. In Egypt we see different Pharaohs making offerings to their predecessors and ranged according to their dynasties for hundreds of years, and these dynasties, with the names and titles of the reigning Pharaohs, Manetho transferred to his history. But the antiquities of the Euphrates, so far as they have been hitherto explored, afford us no such national records. We find on the monuments the names of particular kings, sometimes accompanied by those of their immediate relatives, with some notice of their exploits, but we have nothing like a continuous succession of rulers and dynasties. At present we have no satisfactory materials to found a history upon. Perhaps we had no right to expect any. We may be thankful to our Assyriologists for what they have already done, and must wait patiently till their researches throw fresh light on this obscure subject.

The descendants of Abraham and his kinsmen have

[1] A fantastic chronology seems to have characterized Babylonian literature down to a late period. Callisthenes is said to have sent to Aristotle from Babylon astronomical observations extending over some 30,000 years. A modern editor thought fit to alter the number to 1093 years, which brought it within the limits of possibility. This editorial dishonesty has misled many scholars and among them M. Oppert.

played such a part in the world's history that it is matter of the deepest interest to trace the varied fortunes that befel them. The histories of Edom, Moab, and Ammon were closely interwoven with that of Israel, and therefore have secured a certain amount of attention; but the tale of the Ishmaelites and of the Bene Kedem, whom Abraham sent eastward into 'the east country' (Gen. 25. 6), has received comparatively slight notice.

It is pretty clear from the narratives in Genesis (25. 9) that Ishmael was living south of Canaan at the time of his father's death; but the twelve tribes descended from him (Gen. 25. 13) must have gradually spread over the whole country stretching from Hermon to the southern limits of the northern desert. In the days of Saul (1 Chron. 5. 19) the men of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh expelled the Hagarites, Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab from the district they occupied and dwelt in their stead till the Captivity. Jetur and Nephish were two of the great Ishmaelite tribes, and Nodab was no doubt some division of the Ishmaelite race.

The Ishmaelites thus expelled seem, in part at least, to have taken refuge in the defiles of the neighbouring Hermon, and subsequently to have regained possession of their country, for a portion of it, bordering on Hermon to the east, was long known in classical geography as Ituraea. The chief interest however that belongs to the incident thus recorded in Scripture consists in the use of the term Hagarites—the children of Hagar. We learn from it that the phrase Hagarites and Hagarenes indicated the Ishmaelites that bordered on Damascus; and perhaps we may gather from 1 Chron. 5. 9, &c., that before their expulsion these Hagarenes had settlements as far east as the Euphrates. Tadmor (Palmyra) may have been one of the districts taken from them by the Reubenites, for it was certainly in the possession of an Israelitish people when Solomon built his town there (1 Kings 9. 18).

The southern tribes of Ishmaelites were from the first addicted to commerce; and so generally were they recog-

nized as traders, that their name was given to the neighbouring tribes who followed their example. The 'merchantmen' who bought Joseph of his brethren (Gen. 37) are described as Ishmaelites (vv. 25 and 28), yet we learn from v. 28 that they were by descent Midianites[1]. Again, when Gideon subdued the Midianites, he received their ear-rings as his share of the spoil, 'for they had golden ear-rings because they were Ishmaelites' (Judges 8. 24). Possibly it may have been this misuse of the name that induced the pastoral tribes of the north to drop the name of Ishmaelites and call themselves Hagarenes.

Nebaioth and the kindred tribes occupied the whole country from the Euphrates to the Red Sea (Jos. Ant. I. 12. 4); and in the fourth century B.C. they had possession of Petra. They spoke Aramean (Diod. 19. 96), and it is now a very general opinion that the strange inscriptions on the rocks of the Sinaitic peninsula were the work of this people.

In the inscription at Thebes which describes the campaign of Shishak in Palestine, occur the names Pe-hekran and Naabayt, which modern Egyptologists consider as the names respectively of the Hagarenes and the Nabatheans—the *Pe* in Pe-hekran being the Coptic article; and in the inscriptions describing the conquests of Sennacherib on the Euphrates two of the conquered tribes are termed Hagaranu and Nabatanu. Eratosthenes (Strab. 16. 4. 2, p. 767) represented three races as located in the Northern Desert—the Nabataioi, the Agraioi and the Khaulotaioi—the last, no doubt, representing the men of Havilah[2] who lived in the marshes at the head of the Persian Gulf. For a thousand years before our era the two predominant tribes of the

[1] The Midianites of verse 28 are called Medanites in verse 36, though our authorized version calls them Midianites in both places. This confusion of the two names is the more to be regretted as the distinction between the tribes of Medan and Midian (Gen. 28. 2) is recognized in classical geography.

[2] The Khaulot of Khaulotaioi would exactly represent Havilah, the change of the final *h* into *t* being one of the commonest of the Shemitic letter-changes.

Northern Desert seem to have been the Nabatheans and Hagarenes. Both tribes probably spoke Aramean dialects, and were mixed up in close relations with the civilized races around them. When Mahomedanism arose in the eighth century the Aramean dialects and the civilization they represented sunk beneath the ascendancy of the Arabs proper; and, as Quatremère and Renan have shown, Arab writers treat the 'Nabat' as a Syrian race. That the first of these writers has been betrayed into some mistakes by the strange theory he adopted with respect to these matters, is known to all who take an interest in tracing the history of the Shemitic languages.

The fortunes of Israel are of such absorbing interest that the ruin of the surrounding nations is often passed by almost with indifference. Yet the voice of prophecy foretold their destruction in accents scarcely less awful than those which conveyed the doom of God's chosen people. The shadow was falling upon Edom before Obadiah poured forth his denunciations. Other prophets of evil had preceded him. We have Jeremiah (49. 13) proclaiming 'I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse, &c. Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rocks, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord.' At what particular time this prophecy was fulfilled we do not know, but in the fourth century B.C. Petra was in the hands of the Nabatheans; and the sons of Esau were probably driven from Mount Seir soon after Judah was carried away captive. The future that awaited the Edomites we shall discuss hereafter.

CHAPTER VII.

Egypt. — Mizraim. — Musri; men of the frontiers. — The Old and New Monarchies. — Avaris, Zoan. — Cush, Mizraim, and Phut; the Cushite districts of the Zimri and the Hamitic settlers in Sheba and Dedan; the Egyptian settlements Ludim, Ananim, Pathrusim, Caphtorim, etc. — The children of Shem, Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram. — The districts they occupied; the Chaldees; their origin; the races descended from Abraham, Bene Kedem, Ishmaelites, Hagarenes, Nabatheans, Edomites, etc.

Origin of the terms Eruthraioi, Phoinikes, etc., the names Suroi, Leukosuroi, etc.; the terms Suroi and Aramaioi treated as synonymous by the later Greeks. — The Ereb or 'mingled people' the same as the Rebu of Egyptian history and the Eremboi of the Odyssey; the Ereb of the Desert. — Lud according to Arabian tradition the father of the Amalekites; the Mehunim or Maon; the Amalekites called Makedones in the Septuagint, the same people as the Hykshos. — The Hykshos or Shepherd-kings who invaded Egypt. — The Solumoi of Asia Minor a Shemitic people; dressed their hair in a Sisoē; same mode of dressing the hair prevalent among the nations bordering on Palestine. — The Amalekites and Geshurites some of the most ancient races of Palestine; whence descended; the Amalekites in certain localities called Maachath, whence the name of Makedōn found in the Septuagint; the Maon or Mehunim an Amalekite people; the same as the Magan of the Assyrian inscriptions. — From the Lud, Maon, and Maachath, settled round Palestine, came the Ludoi, Mēones, and Makedones of Lydia.

The mythus of Osiris symbolizes the progress of Egyptian culture rather than of Egyptian conquest; the story of Sesostris made up of legends relating to the conquests of various Egyptian Pharaohs; the mythus relating to Typhon. The expulsion of the Shepherds, the Exodus of the Israelites, and the defeat of 'the peoples of the sea' confounded together by Manetho; hence probably the late date ascribed by Rabbinical writers to the Exodus; Ahmes the first Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty the Pharaoh that expelled the Shepherds, and Thothmes probably the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Zoan an entrenched camp adjoining to Avaris, constructed by the Hykshos' king for the annual gatherings of his people.

The countries whose history we have been investigating lay for the most part in the basin of the Euphrates or on its borders. But in the far West was situate a land, which from the remotest time had been highly civilized, and was inferior to none in power and dignity. The Assyrians



called it Mizir, and this name seems to have prevailed in Arabia, and most of the other Shemitic districts. But the Jews neighboured closely upon Egypt, and were acquainted with its divisions into the upper and the lower country. They accordingly added a dual ending to the name and called the land Mizraim.

On the black obelisk a people called Musri are represented as bringing tribute to Shalmaneser. They have for their beasts of burthen the two-humped or Bactrian camel, and their offerings are such as might have been furnished by eastern Asia. It has been conjectured that they were Egyptians; but the only thing to warrant such a conjecture is similarity of name; in persons and in dress they differ from the Egyptians as widely as they well can do. The name *Musri* was, I believe, merely a variant form of the Assyrian word *mizir*, a frontier land; and as Egypt was the *mizir* on the west, so I believe the district east of Mount Zagros would be regarded by the Assyrians as the eastern *mizir*. The *Musri* were probably the ancestors of the Sanscrit-speaking races—the earliest specimen of the Bactrians, the Aryans, and the kindred tribes among whom at a later period the 'Medes and Persians' re-established their empire. The name may have been looked upon as a mere appellative—the borderers or frontier-men.

The Egyptians resembled the Chinese in their reverence for their ancestors. On the walls of their temples we see the Pharaoh making his offerings to his predecessors, generation after generation, dynasty after dynasty. It was doubtless from these monuments that Manetho and the other Egyptian historians gained their knowledge of the Egyptian dynasties, and learnt the names of the successive Pharaohs. The names they transmitted to us, compared with the hieroglyphs on the monuments, have been the chief means employed by our Egyptologists in settling the phonetic values of these mysterious symbols.

The reigns preceding the eighteenth dynasty are usually called the Old, and those succeeding it the New Monarchy.

The establishment of the eighteenth dynasty forms indeed the great turning-point of Egyptian history. According to Manetho, as reported by Josephus (Contra Apion.), Ahmes, or, as he is called by Josephus, Amosis, drove the shepherd kings from Avaris, and commenced this brilliant line of princes. Josephus, still quoting Manetho (Contra Apion. I. 14), tells us that an obscure people suddenly invaded Egypt and got possession of it without a battle. Their king, Salatis, established himself at Memphis, and to protect himself against the Assyrians erected a stronghold east of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile called Avaris. Here he stationed 240,000 men, and here he came every summer to distribute corn, &c., and to exercise his troops. The people were called Hykshos or Shepherd-kings, *hyk* in the sacred language signifying a king, and *sos* in the common language signifying a shepherd. The Egyptians at length succeeded in expelling the Hykshos, who retired to the district afterwards called Judea, and built Jerusalem.

Josephus, as is well known, wrote his work against Apion in order to establish the antiquity of the Jewish people. It will be seen that he identified them with the Hykshos, and confounded the expulsion of the Hykshos with the Exodus. All are now agreed that the Jewish historian was in grievous error; but the relations that existed between Avaris and Zoan were such as have led certain of our modern Egyptologists into mistakes which are equally gross, and in some of the cases were certainly less pardonable.

De Rougé, with his usual sagacity, maintained the identity of Avaris and Zoan. The name *Ha Ouar* occurs in Egyptian papyri as the native name of Avaris; and as Ha Ouar signifies a haunch, and as Manetho (Jos. Cont. Ap. I. 14) tells us that the name Avaris originated in a certain 'theologia,' it has been conjectured that a portion of the mangled body of Osiris was supposed to have been preserved at Avaris, and was there worshipped. With respect to the origin of Zoan there is a very curious notice in Numbers

(13. 22), from which we learn that 'Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.' As it will appear in the sequel that Zoan was peopled by Amalekites, whose native seats lay immediately south of Hebron, we may trace the link of association, which connected Zoan with Hebron, in the mind of Moses when he wrote the passage we have quoted. As Hebron was built before Sarah's death (Gen. 23. 2) and probably not long before—for it is never mentioned at any earlier period, notwithstanding Abraham's lengthened sojourn in the neighbourhood—we are furnished with an approximate date for the foundation of Zoan.

We have concluded (p. 145) that the great patriarch to whom Abraham did homage could have been no other than his ancestor Eber. Now according to the Hebrew Scriptures, Eber was born sixty-seven years after the Flood (Gen. 10. 11, &c.) and he lived 464 years (Gen. 11. 17); and as Eber was the most ancient of the post-diluvian patriarchs I think we may fairly assume that these dates have been correctly handed down to us. According to this chronology the Flood could not have happened much more than 500 years before Eber's death, that is, about the year 2700 B.C., even assuming that it was at the very close of his life that Eber blessed Abraham. The Septuagint and other versions might give us a longer period, but the longest we can thus obtain is too short for the duration of the Old Monarchy. It seems then to follow that if Zoan was built not more than seven years after the building of Hebron, its foundation and the conquest of Egypt by the Hykshos could not have been synchronous events. I believe these two events were really separated from each other by some centuries.

Our earliest Egyptologists generally considered the Hykshos to be Philistines; and they quoted Herodotus, who tells us (2. 128) that according to Egyptian report the pyramids were the work of the shepherd Philitis, who fed his flocks at that time in these districts. The name Philistines is generally considered to signify emigrants. It has

been supposed to indicate that the Philistines had once been looked upon as strangers in their country. As they were called Philistines in the time of Abraham, their first settlement in Philistia must have been very early. The names of the Shemitic districts are generally ranged from south to north; hence we may conclude that in the series Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad (Gen. 10. 22), Elam was the most southern and Arphaxad the most northern district, and so in the western series Lud, Aram, that Lud was a district lying south of Aram. Hence it would appear that the men of Lud peopled the south of Palestine—a conclusion which is in agreement with the Arabic legends preserved to us in the Historia ante-Islamica of Abulfeda, and may lead us to infer that the Philistines were also a branch of this ancient people. The Arabic legends I have referred to, almost without exception, represent the Amalekites as a branch of the same great family; and we are told (1 Sam. 27. 8) that the Geshurites and Amalekites were of old the inhabitants of the land between Judea and Egypt. I believe that traces of the Amalekites may be found over the whole of Palestine, though obscured by the various names assumed by different sections of this people.

* * * * * *

The other sons of Ham [besides Canaan[1]] were 'Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut.' Nimrod, son of Cush, founded the first monarchy, and its beginning was 'Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.' Babel, we may be sure, was situate on the site, or at least in the neighbourhood of the future Babylon. Erech, there can be little doubt, was the Greek Orkhoē, now Warka, on the southern Euphrates; but the sites of Accad and Calneh have not yet been satisfactorily determined.

There are traces also of Cushite settlement on the Elanitic gulf. When Chedorlaomer invaded Canaan he first attacked the tribes dwelling east of Jordan, 'the Rephaims in Ashteroth Karnaim, and the Zuzims *in Ham*,

[1] See Chap. V.

the Emims in Shaveh Kiriathaim, and the Horites in their mount Seir' (Gen. 14. 5); and he returned northward by the route lying west of the river. The Em-im (Emims) seem to have been the same people as the Egyptian Am-u, *u* and *im* being respectively the Egyptian and Shemitic plural-ending. The Hebrew *am* means a nation, a tribe, and Emim may have been the form its plural took in the dialect of Moab (Deut. 2. 11). Am-u and Em-im seem to have been used in the same general sense as the Hebrew *go-im*, the tribes, the Gentiles. Zuz-im (Zuzims) answers to the Egyptian term Shas-u or shepherds, and were probably the nomade race who at that period were allowed to pasture their flocks in the district called Ham. As the Moabites expelled the Em-im from Moab (Deut. 2. 10), so the Edomites expelled the Horites from Seir (Deut. 2. 12), and the Ammonites expelled the Zamzummims from their borders (Deut. 2. 20). The name Zamzumm-im seems to have been formed by adding the plural-ending *im* to one of those duplicate terms which were so common in the earlier stages of language. *Zam* I believe to be only a variant form of Shem, given to the first settlers of the district in order to distinguish them from their Hamitic neighbours in 'Ham.' When in the seventh century B.C. the Simeonites passed the Ghor in search of new settlements, 'they found fat pasture and good, for *they of Ham* had dwelt there of old' (1 Chron. 4. 40). This passage fixes the position of 'Ham' within narrow limits. Moses married a Midianitish woman (Ex. 2. 21), and the Midianites he thus connected himself with are generally located on the Elanitic gulf, in a district which could not have lain far from the one which has been pointed out as being probably the district in question. Hebrew jealousy represented the Midianitish wife as a Cushite (Ethiopian, Numb. 12. 1), whence we may conclude that she and her family had sojourned in a Cushite district. This conclusion is confirmed by the language of Habakkuk (3. 3), 'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran, &c.

I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction, and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble.' From this district the Cushite gradually disappeared, drained it may be into Africa, or perhaps driven further south into Yemen.

One of those ancient Egyptian tales, which have been so singularly preserved, relates the adventures of a certain foreigner (one of the Amu) who fled from Egypt to Teman the capital of Sakti. The Sakti must have bordered on Egyptian territory, for the Egyptians built fortresses to restrain their inroads, and M. Chabas locates them somewhere in the neighbourhood of Edom, i.e. as it would seem, in the Scriptural Cushan. In a later age Sakti was used in Egyptian writings as a general name for Asia. May there not be a connexion between this name of Sakti and the Scriptural name Sabtechah (Gen. 10. 7)?

The sons of Cush, we are told (Gen. 10. 7), were 'Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtechah, and the sons of Raamah, Sheba and Dedan.' The Septuagint renders Raamah by Rhegma, and according to Stephanus Byzantinus, Rhēgma was the name of a city lying on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and of a bay in that neighbourhood. It is not improbable that Raamah was the ancient name of the people who were afterwards known in Assyrian inscriptions as the Sommari, and in Scripture as the Zimri. They appear to have made settlements at an early period in Sheba and Dedan[1], and to have carried on a caravan trade between the Persian Gulf and the western districts. In the 'Lamentation for Tyrus' Ezekiel tells the great city (27. 20), 'Dedan was thy merchant in precious clothes for chariots. Arabia, and all the princes of Kedar they occupied with thee in lambs, and rams, and goats: in these were they thy merchants. The merchants of Sheba and Raamah, they were thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices and with all precious

[1] Dedan, probably lay somewhere to the south-east of Mount Seir; and Sheba appears to have neighboured upon it to the south, and to have been the earliest settlement of the Joktanites, the name spreading as they advanced into Yemen.

stones, and gold. Haran, and Canneh, and Eden, the merchants of Sheba, Asshur, and Chilmad were thy merchants. These were thy merchants in all sorts of things, in blue clothes, and broidered work, and in chests of rich apparel, bound with cords, and made of cedar, among thy merchandise.' Here Raamah and his colonies Sheba and Dedan figure as a mercantile people, and from the nature of their merchandise we may gather that they brought with them the products of countries bordering on the Euphrates. They seem to have allowed Bedawin tribes (Zuzims) to pasture their herds and flocks in the unoccupied districts of the neighbourhood, and at a later period these nomades were chiefly Midianites. Hence we find Sheba and Dedan enumerated among the descendants of Keturah (Gen. 25. 3). We may, I think, summarize these details as follows: the district lying south of Palestine and Mount Seir—in other words, lying south of the district occupied by the children of Lud—was first settled by the Joktanite Sheba, and perhaps received from them its name. As the Joktanites retired deeper into Yemen, the country was gradually taken possession of by Cushite traders, who permitted certain pastoral races to wander within their borders. Whether in any particular passage the term Sheba signified Joktanites, Cushites, or Midianites can only be gathered from the context.

From Mizraim came 'Ludim and Anamim, and Lehabim, and Naphtuhim, and Pathrusim, and Casluhim (out of whom came Philistim), and Caphtorim.' Mizraim is a noun in the dual form, and it seems almost necessarily to signify the two Egypts, the upper and the lower country. These two districts were from the first distinguished from each other. Their kings had each his peculiar crown, and when the same sovereign reigned over both districts, these crowns were united into one and formed the strange head-gear known as the Pshenk, which Egyptian pictures have made familiar to us.

If the name of Mizraim really included both the districts

which together made up the country of Egypt, it seems clear that we must look beyond the limits of Egypt for the other districts mentioned. The first of these is Ludim. Literally rendered this name signifies the people of, or in, Lud. In order therefore to locate the Ludim, we must first ascertain where was the district which took the name of Lud. Now according to Arabic tradition (Abulfeda, Hist. Ante-Islam., p. 16) the Amalekites were descended from Lud; and many hints, gathered both from Scriptural and classical sources, lead us to the conclusion that several races, Amalek, Maon, &c., claiming Lud for their ancestor, dwelt south of Palestine. The Hebrew word rendered Mehunim in 2 Chron. 26. 7 is merely the plural form of the word Maon, which appears in Judges 10. 12; and therefore the same people must be alluded to in both passages. Again, the same Hebrew plural signifies not only the Mehunim, but also 'habitations'; and our translators gave it this latter meaning in 1 Chron. 4. 41, though there can be little doubt that it there signifies the Mehunim, and should have been so rendered. It would seem therefore that the Maon or Mehunim at one time dwelt somewhere south of Mount Seir; in this neighbourhood is still to be found a town called Maan. The Septuagint renders the Mehunim of 2 Chron. by the term Minaioi, and the Minaioi were a people that are generally located north of Mecca. If the Jews who wrote the Septuagint were not mistaken—and they could hardly be ignorant of the geography of districts so near Egypt—then the Maon, or a portion of them, must have moved south after the eighth century B.C., when the Simeonites attacked them (1 Chron. 4. 41). In 2 Chron. 26. 7 the 'Mehunims' are coupled with the Philistines, the Arabians of Gur-Baal, and the Ammonites, as races conquered by Uzziah; and the people dispossessed by the Simeonites are alluded to as if they were Amalekites (1 Chron. 4. 43). In Judges 10. 12 they are distinguished from the Amalekites, but this is consistent with their being a kindred tribe. In Judges 19. 12 the

Maonites are enumerated among the oppressors of Israel, but it was probably not as an independent power they exercised such oppression, but merely as allies of their neighbours the Midianites (Judges 7. 12). I strongly suspect that in Maon we have the Hebrew form of the name Magan, which so often occurs in the Assyrian inscriptions. It is not improbable that Magan was used by the Assyrians as a general name for the Amalekitish races.

That the Egyptians had settlements in the midst of these Shemitic races is certain. The mines they worked in search of copper and the turquoise are still to be found in the peninsula of Sinai. On the rocks are engraved the names of Pharaohs, some of whom flourished at the very beginning of the Old Monarchy; and there are inscriptions mentioning victories obtained over the tribes in the neighbourhood. The remains at Sarabit el Khadim and Magharah have been minutely described by recent travellers. The Egyptians who held these stations were, I believe, the Lud-im, or people in Lud, mentioned by Moses. Anamim may be a derivative of Noum, a name sometimes given to the Jupiter Ammon of classical mythology. Supposing Noum to take a prosthetic *a*, then Anam-im might signify the men of Anam, i.e. of the God worshipped in the Great Oasis, where the ruins of a temple dedicated to Ammon are still visible. Lehab-im by common consent meant the Libyans. Herodotus tells us (4. 186) that Egyptian habits and customs prevailed in Libya as far as the Syrtes, but that west of the Syrtes the people followed a different mode of life. The latter were probably the ancestors of the modern Berbers. The Naphtuh-im I take to be the men of Napata. South of Assouan (Syene) the Nile takes a sweep to the west through Nubia, and to avoid this bend of the river the caravans sometimes proceed straight through the desert for five or six hundred miles, and reach the river again in the district known in ancient times as Meroe. This district runs along the river some two or three hundred miles till it approaches the highlands of Abyssinia, and

abounds in Egyptian remains, among which are the ruins travellers have fixed upon as indicating the site of Napata. Some seven or eight centuries before the Christian aera the Aethiopians had possession of the town, and in the year 22 B.C. C. Petronius led a Roman army against this people, and took Napata. Pathros seems to represent Nubia, where the remains of Egyptian civilization are almost as numerous as in Egypt itself. In Ezekiel (29. 10) the prophet foretells that 'the land of Egypt' shall be waste 'from the tower of Syene even unto the border of Ethiopia,' and that God 'will scatter the Egyptians among the nations and disperse them through the countries;' but that at the end of forty years he will 'gather the Egyptians from the people whither they were scattered, and will bring again the captivity of Egypt and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation.' Here Ezekiel gives to Pathros the limits geographers assign to Nubia. The name Egyptians, given to the inhabitants, shows how close were the ties which at that time connected the Egyptian settlement with the mother-country.

The opinions now prevalent as to the position of the Casluhim and the Caphtorim vary widely from those which prevailed at an earlier period. The writers of the Septuagint, the early biblical critics, and in later times Bochart and Gesenius identify Caphtor with Cappadocia without scruple or hesitation. As there is no reasonable doubt[1] that the early Egyptians settled an Egyptian colony in Colchis, they must necessarily have passed through Cappadocia, and probably colonized it. Modern critics pass over this fact in silence, assume that the ancients rested their opinions solely on the similarity of the names Caphtorim and Cappadoc-es, and then advance in their turn hypotheses the most arbitrary, which have nothing to support them but forced and unnatural etymologies. The apparently contradictory statements, 'Casluhim out of

[1] Vide p. 102.

whom came Philistim' (Gen. 10. 14), and 'the Caphtorims' (Philistines) 'which came forth out of Caphtor' (Deut. 2. 23) may be reconciled if we remember how vague and indefinite were at all times the boundaries assigned to Cappadocia. Sometimes it designated the country lying immediately north of the Taurus range; and sometimes it designated the whole valley of the Halys and included districts which were generally assigned to Colchis. It is even possible that the passage in Deut. 2. 23 may have been one of the explanatory glosses added by Ezra, when according to Jewish tradition he revised the Pentateuch. It certainly has the appearance of an interpolation.

It is hazardous, in the present state of philology, to deal with the letter-changes of these remote ages; and it would be as rash to assert as to deny a connexion between the names Cappadoc-es, and Caphtor-im. But etymological speculation is allowable in a case like the present, if we do not lay undue stress upon it. Now Pliny (5. 20) tells us that, according to Domitius Corbulo, the Euphrates rose in Mount Aba; according to Licinius Mucianus at the roots of a mountain called Capotes or Capodes. Aba must be the branch of Anti-Taurus usually called Abus, of which Mount Argaeus is the highest point. The eastern side of Mount Argaeus drains into the Euphrates, and the western into a principal branch of the Halys, and S. Martin (1. 43) supposes the Armenian word *gaboïd*, blue, commonly applied to lofty mountains, to be the root of the word Capotes or Capodes, which it would seem was the native name of Mount Abus. Pliny (6. 3) calls a branch of the Halys Cappadox, and as the neighbourhood is generally considered to have been a Celtic district, and, as in all the Celtic dialects derivatives in *awg* or *ac*, both adjectival and substantival, are common, Cappodoc-s may signify the river of the Capodes or blue mountains. Nothing is more common in geography than for a river to take at different times the names of its different affluents, and it is not improbable that the name of Cappadox sometimes accom-

panied the river to the sea. If so, the whole district as far as the Euxine would naturally take the name of Cappadocia.

If we adopt the hypothesis I have sketched out, we shall find the names of the Egyptian settlements ranged in a very definite order; first the easternmost, the Ludim, then the two western settlements the Lehabim and the Anamim, then the two southern settlements, the Pathrusim and the Naphtuhim, and lastly the two settlements in the far north, the Caphtorim and the Casluhim. We have evidence, historical or monumental, of a connexion between Egypt and all these districts, Caphtorim excepted; a circumstance which leads me to place much confidence in the general accuracy of the results we have arrived at. The prevalent notion that the districts we have been treating of were portions of Egypt proper, seems to me not only to rest on forced etymologies, but to be vicious in principle. A historian might reasonably represent the men of Canada, of Australia, of the United States, &c., as descended from the men of Britain; but he could not, with any propriety of language, attribute such a descent to the men of Kent, of Middlesex, of Essex, &c. It would be almost as much as to say they were self-descended.

Fut, a river of Mauritania mentioned by Pliny (5. 1), is referred to by Josephus (Ant. 1. 6) as illustrating the name of Phut; whence we may gather that in his opinion the inhabitants of this district, or in other words, the Berber tribes, were the people indicated by this Scriptural name. Recent inquiries show that the language of the Tuarick—that is, of the great tribe spread over the Sahara from Algiers to Negroland — is essentially a Berber dialect, though unintelligible to the tribes settled on the Mediterranean. As Herodotus[1] observed a marked difference between the races living east and west of the Syrtes, it seems not improbable that under the name Phut Moses included all the Berber tribes dwelling on the Mediterranean from

[1] Herod. 4, 186.

the Syrtes westward. The dialects spoken by the Berber tribes on the shores of the Mediterranean have been all more or less acted upon by Shemitic influences, but the Tuarick seems to be a language comparatively pure, and a careful investigation of its peculiarities might lead to results philologically important.

The people bearing the name of Phut (Gen. 10. 6) occupy a prominent place in the prophetical Scriptures. They appear as allies or mercenaries both of Egypt and of Tyre; but it is difficult to identify them with any of the races that figure on the Egyptian monuments. The two races which appear to have the nearest affinity to them are the Pount and the Kufa. Both these were red races, and the Pount, it is now generally agreed, were settled in southern Arabia. They were no doubt the Eruthraioi of the Greek geographers, and this race, or I would rather say this name, of Eruthraioi is found spread over a great extent of country. We might almost draw the conclusion that it was used as a general name for the copper-coloured races. The Scriptural Phut and Egyptian Pount were probably in origin the same people, but I cannot satisfactorily make out the connexion.

The children of Shem were 'Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, Lud and Aram.' The name of Elam survived in that of Elymais, a district lying east of the Tigris, near its junction with the Euphrates. The limits assigned to this district by different classical writers vary greatly, and will not much assist us in fixing the limits of the Scriptural Elam. The limits of Asshur[1] I think we may venture to lay down somewhat more definitely, though in so doing we shall have to depart widely from the notions at present current on the subject. The early cities of Asshur were 'Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen

[1] Susiana, or the district dependent on Shushan, was formed out of the districts lying north and south of it, just as London has absorbed large portions of Surrey and Middlesex. We find the borders of Elam and Susiana frequently confounded by later writers.

between Nineveh and Calah, the same is a great city.' According to Gen. 2. 14, Hiddekel (the Tigris) 'goeth toward the *east* of Assyria. This text has always seemed to me directly opposed to the view which confined ancient Assyria to the neighbourhood of Nineveh. Calah, I am inclined to think, lay in the district which in the later Scriptures[1] is called Halah, and which in all probability was the same as the Calakhenē of Ptolemy. This district seems to have lain *west* of the Khabour (Habor of Scripture) for it neighboured upon Gozan. Resen also may have lain in the basin to the east of the Khabour, and considerably to the north of a line joining Calah and Nineveh, but as the site of neither city—merely the locality of their respective districts—is known, we cannot say how far the requirements of Scripture are met which fix Resen *between* Calah and Nineveh. The geography of that period was loose and indefinite, and possibly the peculiarities of the country—the fords, &c.—may have necessitated a more northerly route from Calah to Nineveh than would at first sight seem probable. Rehoboth may possibly be represented by the village called Rohabeh, which lies east of the Euphrates, a little below its junction with the Khabour. Important remains are still to be found in the neighbourhood. According to this theory, the whole upland north of the alluvial flat of Shinar, and stretching from the valley of the Tigris to the valley of the Khabour and the Euphrates, was the district which in Scripture is called Asshur.

We have concluded that districts lying on both sides of the Khabour were settled by races of Assyrian descent; but there can be no doubt that some portion of this fertile district was occupied by the descendants of Aram. It seems to have been called by the Jews Aram-Naharaim (Gen. 24. 10), i.e. Aram of the two rivers, and to have been part of the Egyptian Naharaina, which latter district probably included the valley of the upper Tigris. From Aram-

[1] 2 Kings 18. 11; 1 Chron 5. 26.

Naharaim must have stretched a line of Aramaic settlements to Damascus. The country between these two limits is now desert, but is still more or less covered with the remains of towns which were abandoned at the time of the Mahomedan conquest, and have never been re-peopled. There are large tracts which are capable of cultivation and were no doubt once an inhabited district. It is probable that the wide upland stretching south from Mons Masius, on both sides of the Euphrates, was known as the Padan or plain—Padan-Aram being that portion of it which was inhabited by the Arami, and included Aram-Naharaim, Aram-Zobah, &c. (2 Sam 10. 6). It may be inferred from Assyrian inscriptions that in the seventh century B.C. Arameans were on the Euphrates *south* of its junction with the Khabour.

It is not easy to assign proper localities to the Aramean tribes, 'Uz and Hul, and Gether and Mash' (Gen. 10. 23). Josephus tells us (Ant. 1. 6. 4) that Ousos settled Trakhonitis and Damascus, and as Uz certainly bordered upon Edom (Lament. 4. 21), we may infer that this patriarch settled in the district lying south of Damascus. Ptolemy (5. 19) mentions a people called Aisitai, and apparently locates them in this neighbourhood, and both Bochart and Gesenius would identify them with the men of Uz. Hul is placed in Armenia by Josephus (Ant. 1. 6. 4), and also by Jerome; whence it would appear that these authors were inclined to fix Hul in the northern parts of Padan-Aram. Balaam was brought from Aram out of the mountains of the East (Numb. 23. 7), and as the Aramean districts are mostly situate in plains, and as the river near which Balaam lived (Numb. 22. 5) is generally considered to be the Euphrates, it seems probable that Balaam lived in the district where the Euphrates works its way through the mountains of Armenia, or in other words, through the 'Mons Masius.' Here, then, I would fix the Aramean tribe, the Mash, and it is important to fix the locality of this people, for there is reason to believe that they gave rise to

the Musoi of the Greeks, and the Moesi of the Latin geographers.

Immediately to the west, and alongside these Aramean settlements, lay those of the Hittites mentioned in the later Scriptures. The latter in their northern borders must have touched on the Euphrates and Mons Masius, and stretched south-westward between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon into Palestine. Both Hittites and Arami inhabited narrow strips of territory touching northward on the Armenian mountains, and terminating southward respectively in Palestine and the neighbourhood of Edom. Want of unity prevented either of these races from making any great exhibition of national strength, but the Kheta or Hittites more than once braved the power of Egypt; and Damascus in the seventh and eighth century B.C. not only threw terror into the heart of Samaria. but seems to have checked for a time the progress of Assyria westward.

During the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. the plain of Philistia seems to have been ravaged alternately by the Assyrians (Isaiah 20. 1) and by the Egyptians. About the year 630 B.C. Psammetichus, after a siege of twenty years, took Ashdod, and some twenty years afterwards Pharaoh 'smote Gaza' (Jer. 47. 1). At this period Zephaniah (2. 4) declared 'Gaza shall be forsaken, and Ashkelon a desolation: they shall drive out Ashdod at the noon day, and Ekron shall be rooted up. Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea coast, the nation of the Cherethites! the word of the Lord is against you; O Canaan, the land of the Philistines, I will even destroy thee, that there shall be no inhabitant. And the sea coast shall be dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks.'

Jeremiah (25. 20) had already handed the wave cup of the Lord's fury to 'all the kings of the land of the Philistines, and Ashkelon, and Azzah (Gaza), and Ekron, and the remnant of Ashdod,' the sea coast, and announced (47. 4) 'the Lord will spoil the Philistines, the remnant of the country of Caphtor. Baldness is come upon Gaza, Ashkelon is cut off

with the remnant of their valley.' The words of Ezekiel (25. 16) are no less awful, 'I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims, and destroy the remnant of the sea coast, and I will execute great vengeance upon them,' &c. The prophetic vision of Amos (1. 7) had seen the approaching misery a century and a half before these later utterances, 'I will send a fire on the wall of Gaza which shall devour the palaces thereof, and I will cut off the inhabitant from Ashdod, and him that holdeth the sceptre from Ashkelon, and I will turn mine hand against Ekron, and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord God.'

The reader will have remarked how often in these passages occurs the word 'remnant'—that word which carries with it such a fearful significance in the prophetical Scriptures. It shows us how repeatedly the ravages of war had passed over the country. It must indeed have been a desolation; and when Judah was carried away captive to Babylon, the whole land from the mountains of Seir and the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean was probably an almost uninhabited waste. Let us endeavour to trace the steps by which it was gradually repeopled.

Though Mount Seir was desolate, the Edomites were to be still a people at the time the king of the North was to struggle with the king of the South (Dan. 11. 41), and we gather from the last of the prophets (Mal. 1. 3) that the Edomites long cherished the hope of recovering the home of their fathers. 'I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas Edom saith, we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of Hosts They shall build, but I will throw down,' &c. After they were driven from their mountains, the Edomites seem to have spread themselves over the vacant districts of Judah and Philistia, and to have founded the Idumaea of classical geography. Judah was certainly parcelled out among the Jews on their return to Jerusalem in the year

445 B.C. (Neh. 11), but their occupation of the land must have been partial or temporary, for Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc. 5. 65) took Hebron from the Idumeans in the year 164 B.C., and shortly afterwards took Azotus in the land of the Philistines (1 Macc. 5. 68). It is probable that when the Edomites reduced Judah and Philistia into an Idumean district, they intermixed with such remnants of the original population as still lingered in their native seats, and it may have been with reference to this mixture of races that the Lord declared by the mouth of Zechariah (9. 6) 'a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines.'

As Nehemiah was pushing forward the building of Jerusalem, he had to deal with enemies which threatened him from four different quarters. The Ammonites (Neh. 2. 19), the Moabites (Horonite), Geshem the Arabian (Ib. 19), and the men of Ashdod (4. 7) were all watching him with eyes of jealousy and hatred. Geshem the Arabian may have been the Nabathean chief that was then reigning at Petra, and the men of Ashdod the Idumeans who had established themselves in Azotus. The notion that these men of Ashdod were Philistines seems to be a mistake. The Philistines as a people must have perished in the sixth century B.C., and, though some remnants of the race may have survived in Azotus and elsewhere, it was probably merely as subjects to the intrusive race, the Edomites. The classical geographers make the name of Idumaea reach from the sea-coast inland as far as the range of Mount Seir, and the whole of this district appears to have been in the occupation of the Edomites.

All this displacement of peoples produced a confusion which was every whit as bewildering to the Greeks as to ourselves. Their historians are quite at sea when they endeavour to distinguish between these shifting populations. Herodotus sometimes draws a line of distinction between Surioi and Phoinikes, and sometimes confounds them together, and even includes the Jews in the medley

(Herod. 2. 104). When describing the fleet which Xerxes collected in his expedition against Greece he tells us (7. 89) 'The Phoinikes with the Surioi of Palestine brought three hundred ships, &c. These Phoinikes dwelt in ancient times, as they themselves say, on the Erythræan Sea, and having passed from thence they inhabit the parts of Suriē by the sea. This district of Suriē and the whole country as far as Egypt is called Palestine.' Here the Phoinikes, though distinguished from the Suroi, are nevertheless represented as dwelling in Suriē, and like inconsistencies of statement are common. They may perhaps be best explained by investigating the origin and nature of the phrases Suroi, Phoinikes, Eruthraioi, &c.[1]

The country between Mount Seir and Egypt was occupied, for the most part, by nomade tribes, but on the coast at Rhinocorura was a people called by the Hebrews Ereb, and by the Egyptians Rebu, of whom we shall speak shortly. All these tribes, whether settled or nomade, seem to have been allied with or subject to the men of Seir, and I believe the Egyptians upon occasions called the whole district the country of the Sharu or men of Seir. Modern Egyptologists generally write the name Kharu, and Dr. Birch supposes Kharu to mean the Suroi or Syrians. It has been said they must have dwelt on the coast because the Egyptians are said to have gone by sea to procure the wines of the Sharu. But if the Egyptians had sailed to Rhinocorura they might be said to sail to the land of Kharu, or, writing the word according to the old form, the Sharu. At the time these voyages took place no Assyrian empire had existed, nor was there such a people as the Suroi or any people that could represent them. The Edomites were the only people of that period who could have acted the part assigned to the Sharu. Their national importance, and their intimate relations with Egypt before the time of David, are clearly shown in Scripture. They are the only people beyond the pale of Israel of whom any regnal list

[1] See above, Chap. V, p. 153.

has been handed down to us (Gen. 36. 31), and their cantons or provinces are carefully particularized (Ib. 36. 15). It must be remembered that before the Edomites conquered Seir other races had possession of the surrounding country, and it was probably from these earlier races that it obtained the name of Sakti (p. 176) and of Sae[nk]ti (p. 197). There are many circumstances which tend to show us that remnants of these older races still clung to their ancient seats, and though subject to were not absorbed by the intrusive race. The Maon or Mehunim were probably settled east of Seir, in the neighbourhood of the modern Maan. They were in all probability Amalekites in origin, and though they figure as descendants of Esau (Gen. 36. 16) must have been merely an allied and subject race. After their conquest by the Simeonites (1 Chron. 4. 41) they seem to have retreated into Yemen, where they were long known as the Minaioi. They seem to be referred to by Abulfeda under the name of Djorhom.

The displacement of peoples which took place during the two centuries following the year 600 B.C. is very bewildering to the historian. Up to that period the rich plain lying west of the highlands of Israel had been occupied by the Philistines for some thirteen or fourteen centuries, and for nearly the same length of time the men of Edom and of Moab had found a home in the mountains lying east of the Dead Sea. During those two centuries the Philistines disappeared as a people, and the Edomites were driven from their native mountains never to return. In Hebrew *seir* means rugged, and Mount Seir was a long, narrow, rocky ridge, stretching from near the head of the Elanitic gulf to beyond the northern limit of the Dead Sea. It was intersected by ravines and ledges of great fertility, and must have formed a natural fortress, barring all progress eastward, and dominating over the low country round it.

Territorial and political arrangements have at all periods more or less confounded distinctions of race. During the Middle Ages foreign ecclesiastics not unfrequently visited

and sometimes died in these islands, and in the obituaries we find these foreigners designated as 'Romans.' The phrase merely meant that they came from a country which had once been a portion of the Roman Empire—that they belonged in short to the 'Romania,' not the 'Barbaria' of the period. By descent they may have been Celts, or Slaves, or Basques. After the conquests of Alexander every third Asiatic was a 'Greek,' though in a majority of cases we had only to strip off the pallium to find a Barbarian beneath it. In the time of Herodotus Asia was part of the Persian Empire, but the Persian conquest was comparatively recent, and the marks of Lydian and Assyrian supremacy were still deeply impressed upon the country. There was accordingly a tendency to consider the several peoples west of the Halys as Lydian, and those east of it as Assyrian, or as they were called, Suroi or Surioi.

Herodotus (7. 63) represents Surioi as the name given by the Greeks to the people whom 'the barbarians' called Assurioi; and though this statement has been questioned, I see no reason for doubting its correctness. It would seem that Suroi was the name current among the Greeks for the various subjects of the Assyrian empire, and that when the travels of Herodotus had made him acquainted with the more perfect form of the word, educated Greeks, following his example, appropriated Assurioi as the name of the Assyrians proper, and continued to use the popular form Surioi or Suroi for the name of the races on the Mediterranean who were more familiarly known to them. The prevalence of Greek literature gave currency to the name, and the district whose inhabitants were thus known as the Surioi still continues to be called Syria.

We have already observed that general terms are often used in Scripture with a special signification, only to be determined by the context. The term Ludim, taken independently, means the people of Lud; but the context shows that in Genesis 10. 13 it must have meant the Egyptian colonists in Lud, and in like manner Kittim in Genesis

10. 4 must have signified not the people of Kit generally, but the Greeks living in that Phoenician district[1]. The Midianitish wife of Moses was called a Cushi or Ethiopian (Numb. 12. 1), merely because the Midianitish horde she belonged to pastured their flocks in a Cushite district. Again, the Jew when he offered the first-fruits was to say, 'An Arami (Syrian) ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and became there a nation great,' &c. (Deut. 26. 5), though Jacob was born in Palestine, and had merely been a sojourner in Padan-Aram. This word Arami has a very comprehensive meaning in Scripture. Owing to the stream of commerce which passed through Damascus, the great city of Aram, the term Arami seems to have been loosely applied to most of the races dwelling in the northern half of the Northern Desert[2]. The Rechabites took refuge in Jerusalem 'for fear of the army of the Chaldeans, and for fear of the army of Aram' (Jer. 35. 11), though the Arami could have been only one of the tribes that swelled Nebuchadnezzar's army. So when Moab and Ammon came against Jehoshaphat, he was told, 'there cometh a great multitude against thee from beyond the sea (the Dead Sea), on this side Aram' (Syria) (2 Chron. 20. 2), where Aram is used to denote generally the country east of the Dead Sea[3].

It would seem that in Scripture only two divisions of the Shemitic dialects were generally recognized—'the language of Canaan,' or, 'the Jews' language,' as it was sometimes called, and the Aramaic, or, as our translators render it, the Syrian. We hear nothing of the language of Elam, or of Asshur, or of Philistia; the tongue of the Chaldeans (Khasdim) (Dan. 1. 4) was clearly Aramaic, for when

[1] Vide Chap. IX, p. 264.

[2] As the term Ishmaelites was applied to the races dwelling in the southern part of this district. Vide p. 167.

[3] In this case there may be some doubt whether we should not read Edom instead of Aram. The Hebrew letters spelling the two names are easily confounded, and sometimes they certainly were so; compare 1 Chron. 18. 11 with 2 Sam. 8. 12.

Daniel gives us the speech of the Khasdim, he drops his native Hebrew and adopts the Aramaic (Dan. 2. 4).

Aramaic dialects seem to have been spoken by the Shemitic tribes settled on the Euphrates, but not to have been understood by the Jews and their Phoenician neighbours. When the Assyrians besieged Jerusalem the Jewish princes entreated Rabshakeh to speak in Aramaic, and not in the 'Jews language, in the ears of the people that were on the wall' (Isai. 36. 11). Again, when the Khasdim addressed Nebuchadnezzar in his great city of Babylon, their speech, as we have seen, was Aramaic (Dan. 2. 4). So also when the kings of Persia held communications with their officers 'on this side the river,' it was conveyed to them in the Aramaic, or Syriac tongue (Ezra 4. 7); and in a subsequent age, when the Nabatheans of Petra held communications with the Roman authorities (Diod. 19. 96), it was also in Aramaic. The speech of Ashdod (Neh. 13. 24), as spoken in the fifth century B.C., may have been a dialect of the same language.[1]

Strabo and the later Greeks treated the name of Suroi as if it were synonymous with Arimoi, or Aramaioi. It is probable the custom arose from a hasty generalization. It may have been found that Arimaioi was the native name of certain tribes popularly known among the Greeks as Suroi, and hence they may have drawn the inference that Suroi was in all cases the Greek equivalent for Arimaioi. Herodotus (1. 72 and 7. 72) gives the name of Suroi to the Kappadokai, and Strabo (16. 1. 2) tells us 'the name of Suroi extended from Babylonia as far as the bay of Issus, and in former times from thence to the Euxine; for both sections of the Kappadokes, those at the Taurus and those on the Pontus, are even to this day called Leuko-Suroi (White Syrians), as there are also certain Suroi who are black, but these live without the Taurus.'

The same geographer also (12. 3. 9), alluding to the name of Suroi given by Herodotus to the Kappadokai, adds,

[1] Vide p. 188.

'they are even to this day called Leuko-Suroi (White Syrians), those beyond the Taurus being also called Suroi, but having, in comparison with those who live within the Taurus, a sun-burnt skin, they have not had the same appellation given them.' It would seem that Strabo classed the Phoinikes proper among the Suroi, but distinguished them as being a darker coloured race from the Leuco-Suroi. Some of these neighbours seem to have once occupied the country which the Kilikes conquered and called Kilikia. Strabo tells us (13. 4. 6, p. 627) that some persons considered the Arimoi to be the same people as those who in his days were called Arimaioi, and say that the Kilikes from Troas came into Syria and took from the Suroi the country called Kilikia. Callisthenes fixed the Arimoi near the Cilician river known as the Calycadnus, and says that from them the adjacent mountains were called Arima (Ib.). Strabo in one place states that the Suroi called themselves Arammaioi (1. 2, p. 42).

There was an Äreb or 'mixed multitude' which joined in the Exodus from Egypt (Exod. 12. 38). It was this people whose lust after flesh tempted Israel to sin (Numb. 11. 4), and brought upon them the wrath of God. The name then disappears from the narrative; and it is probable that the Äreb were left behind in the wilderness Et Tih, when the Israelites advanced upon Canaan, for we have no reason to believe that the Äreb ever entered the promised land. In the list of the peoples for whom at the close of the seventh century B.C. the cup of fury was prepared, Jeremiah records (25. 20) the king of Egypt, 'and all the mingled people' (Ereb), 'and all the kings of the land of Uz, and all the kings of the land of the Philistines,' &c.; and he afterwards (25. 24) speaks of 'all the kings of Arabia (Arab), and all the kings of the mingled people (Ereb) that dwell in the desert,' &c. We may, I think, reasonably conclude, that Äreb and Ereb are merely varied forms of the same word, and that the Äreb of Genesis were the same people as the Ereb whom Jeremiah connects with the

Egyptians and Philistines. Who were the Ereb of the Desert is a question we shall be better able to discuss shortly.

Herodotus (3. 5) represents the Mediterranean coast south of Phoinike as belonging to the Palestinian Suroi as far south as Kadutis[1] (Gaza), to the Arabians from Kadutis to Jēnusos, and to the Suroi from Jēnusos to the Serbonitic Lake, that is, to the very borders of Egypt. The 'Suroi' living in the latter district I believe to be the Ereb whom Jeremiah associates with Egypt and Philistia, and in the wilderness adjoining Egypt I believe this people settled, when they separated from the Israelites. We find these Ereb associated with Egypt by Ezekiel as well as by Jeremiah. When Ezekiel proclaimed the doom of Egypt (30. 5) he brought the sword upon 'Cush, and Phut, and Lud, and all the Ereb.' All these races are connected more or less intimately with Egypt, either as mercenaries or as neighbours. Again, in the Odyssey (4. 82) Menelaus describes his travels:

> 'In the eighth year I arrived,
> After wandering over Cyprus, Phoinike, and among the Egyptians,
> And I went to the Aithiopes and the Sidonioi and the Eremboi
> And Libue.'

Many attempts have been made to explain the term Eremboi in ancient (Strab. 1. 2. 34, p. 42) as well as in modern times. I believe they were the Ereb whose history we are now discussing. I think it also probable that the Aithiopes were the people Herodotus calls the Arabians, and that they were termed Aithiopes for the same reason as the Midianites,[2] viz. because they were a nomade race pasturing their flocks in a Cushite district.[3]

The district lying between Jēnusos and the frontiers of

[1] Katatu was the Egyptian name for Gaza; vide Annals of Thothmes III in Rev. Arch. for 1861, pp. 348, 349.

[2] Vide pp. 175, 176.

[3] The country lying north-east of Egypt probably received its name of *Sakti* from one of the Cushite families, and the Scriptural name of Cushan may have originated from these Cushite Sakti.

Egypt is about three days' journey in length, and is very scantily supplied with water (Herod. 3. 5). There might be a question how, under these circumstances, the inhabitants could have attained to the position which the Eremboi of the Odyssey and the Ereb of Scripture seem to have arrived at. Recent travellers inform us that at certain seasons of the year these arid plains are swarming with the Bedawin and their flocks, and Jerome (Pref. to Amos) tells us that although the dry and sandy soil produced no corn, &c., 'cuncta sunt plena pastoribus ut sterilitatem terrae compensent pecorum multitudine.' But it was to their commerce rather than to their flocks and herds that the Ereb were indebted for the consideration they enjoyed among their neighbours. Petra in Mount Seir was a great centre of trade; thither came not only the commerce of the Lower Euphrates, but also that of Arabia by the Elanitic gulf (Strab. 16. 4. 24, p. 781), and Rhinocorura in the country of the Ereb was the port of Petra (Ib.), just as Tyre was the port from which was shipped the commerce that passed through Damascus. When the Egyptians succeeded in diverting the Arabian traffic and carried it down the Nile, they must have inflicted a deep injury on their neighbours the Ereb[1].

We are now, I think, in a position to explain how the Ereb came to be located in the Desert. The kings of the Ereb that dwelt in the Desert (Jer. 25. 24) must be the kings of the Ereb[2], who of their traffic brought tribute to King Solomon (1 Kings 10. 15). The Ereb seem to have been not content with their profits as exporters. Like the Amalekites, the Ishmaelites, &c., they spread themselves

[1] Among the various plans that were suggested for securing a safe and convenient route to India, was a proposal to carry a line of traffic from the head of the Elanitic gulf to El Arish in the Mediterranean. Rhinocorura could not have lain far from El Arish; had the proposed plan been carried out, we might have seen a revival of the commerce which formerly gave importance to the Eremboi.

[2] Our authorized version has 'kings of Arabia.' But this is a mis-rendering of the original. The words actually employed are the very same as those used by Jeremiah.

over the Northern Desert, and were probably engaged in the caravan trade between Petra and the Euphrates. The exigencies of trade would often bring these Ereb of the Desert to Babylon, and they seem to have been there, perhaps in the character of mercenaries, when the prophet foretold the doom that awaited both it and them (Jer. 50. 37).

In these Ereb we must, I think, recognize the Rebu who figure so prominently in the Hieroglyphic inscriptions. The final *u*, the well-known plural ending of the ancient Egyptian, seems to have been also used as a suffix; and it would be quite in agreement with hieroglyphic interpretation to prefix a vowel to the initial *r*. The Rebu were enemies of Ramses II, but it was chiefly in the reign of his successor Menephtha that they made themselves formidable to Egypt. In his reign a confederacy of tribes, headed by the Rebu, and sometimes called 'peoples of the sea,' invaded Egypt. The invasion is described in an inscription at Thebes, which was translated first by Dr. Birch (Arch. 38. 373), and afterwards by De Rougé. De Rougé tells us the Rebu were Libyans 'incontestablement,' and this notion has been adopted by Brugsch and others. It is true the hieroglyphic sign for *r* may also be read *l*, and Lebu certainly approaches near to the Lehab-im of Genesis 10. 13, and the Lub-im of Nahum 3. 9, but I cannot think the Rebu were the Libyans. The Lehab-im of Genesis were descended from the Mizraim, and therefore we might expect to see them depicted in Egyptian pictures as red men, whereas the Rebu are always represented distinctly as white men. Again, we find the Rebu drawn with the northern flower hanging from their necks, and I cannot imagine any circumstances under which the Libyans could have been indicated by this symbol. Lastly, in a hieroglyphic inscription the Rebu are described as nomades of Se(uk)ti (Arch. 38. 378) and Sati or Sakti is generally acknowledged to be the district lying north-east of Egypt. I believe the conclusion arrived at

by the French Egyptologist to be a mistake, and a very mischievous one; for his authority has caused it to be very generally accepted. I know of nothing that can be urged in its favour, except the resemblance between the words Lebu and Libya.

When in the days of Abraham Chedorlaomer and the confederate kings crossed the desert, they came to 'En-mishpat, which is Kadesh, and smote all the country of the Amalekites' (Gen. 14. 7). At this period Amalek was apparently dwelling immediately south of what was afterwards called the hill-country of Judah. When Moses, four centuries afterwards, brought the Israelites out of Egypt, they were attacked by Amalek as they entered the peninsula of Sinai (Exod. 17. 8); and when the spies entered Canaan they found Amalek 'in the land of the south' (Numb. 13. 29); and it is further stated that 'the Amalekites and the Canaanites dwelt in the valley' (Numb. 14. 25). Again, when Balaam was prophesying on the heights of Moab, he 'looked on Amalek and said, Amalek was the first of the nations, but his latter end shall be that he perish for ever' (Numb. 24, 20); and four or five centuries afterwards 'Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur that is over against Egypt' (1 Sam. 15. 7). From the days of Abraham, therefore, to those of Saul, that is for 1000 years, the Amalekites must have dwelt in the country lying between Palestine and Egypt.

The district stretching from Havilah to Shur was of great extent. We need not therefore be surprised at finding that other races besides Amalek were located there. One of the sons of Joktan was named Havilah (Gen. 10. 29), whence we may conjecture that in the eastern parts the Amalekites were intermixed with Joktanite Arabs. Again, we are told that the sons of Ishmael dwelt from 'Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt' (Gen. 25. 18). So that the Ishmaelites in the time of Moses must have spread through the whole district as joint occupants with the Amalekites. After the time of Saul the name of

Amalek gradually disappears from history. Remains of this people, we have reason to believe, lingered on in the neighbourhood of Havilah[1], but the larger portion seems to have been absorbed in the great Ishmaelite tribe of the Nabatheans.

I have little doubt that in dealing with the Amalekites we are tracing the later fortunes of the Hykshos, the 'shepherd-kings,' that at an early period invaded Egypt, and reduced the inhabitants to a degrading servitude. Balaam represents Amalek (Numb. 24. 20) as having been the first of the nations (*goim*), and when contemplating the future glory of the king of Israel foretells that he shall be 'higher than Agag' (Numb. 24. 7). This name recurs in 1 Sam. 15, and appears to have been the official title of the king of Amalek, just as Pharaoh was the official title of the king of Egypt; and I can best account for the terms in which Balaam speaks of Agag and the Amalekites by supposing that Amalekite kings were at one time the lords of Egypt. All the Arab writers of the Middle Ages referred to by Abulfeda in his Historia Ante-Islamica, speak of the Amalekite rule in Egypt as a historical fact; and the best of these authorities represent the Pharaoh who was Joseph's friend as an Amalekite, and the king who expelled the Hebrews as belonging to the native Egyptian race who succeeded in driving out the Amalekites. Our modern Egyptologists seem, on the whole, agreed in considering Joseph's Pharaoh—not indeed as an Amalekite—but as one of the shepherd-kings, though still at issue as to the nationality of the Pharaoh who expelled the Israelites. They *may* have been in origin sons of Eber, or of Canaan, or of Lud, and if the last, they may have been connected with the Amalekites; for Arabic historians, almost without exception, represent the Amalekites as one of the races descended from Lud[2]. That the Amalekites and other races

[1] Lenormant (Lettres Assyriennes, p. 45) refers to a Persian tribe called Agagi.

[2] Vide Abulfeda, Hist. Ante-Islamica, p. 16.

settled round Palestine passed into Asia Minor at a very remote period cannot be well doubted. In his account of the races that followed Xerxes, Choerilus (Jos. Contra Apion. I. 22) thus describes the Solumoi of Lycia:—

'And after them came a people strange to see
Uttering from month the Phoenician speech,
They dwelt on the Solyman mountains by a spacious lake
Having staring tops, and down from above
They carried the skins of horses' heads dried in the smoke.'

Herodotus (I. 173) tells us that the Solumoi were the oldest people in Lycia; and that they were a Shemitic people might be inferred from the topography of the country. The range of the Solyman mountains was called Kabalais, which is evidently the same word as the Hebrew *gebel*, a mountain. The extremity of this range abutted on the sea, and was called Masikutos (Ptol. 5. 3). At its foot was a narrow and dangerous pass, and Bochart supposes Masikutos to represent a supposed Shemitic word *mesukot,* the straits. As the Hebrew *matsuk* (1 Sam. 14. 5) signifies the face of a rock, I would rather have rendered *mesukot* the *cliffs*. Again, Jeremiah twice alludes to certain tribes in Arabia who had 'their corners polled[1].' He locates them in the wilderness (Jer. 9. 26) as a nation of shepherds (Jer. 49. 32). The Israelites as they were entering Canaan were especially warned against this practice of rounding the corners of their hair (Levit. 19. 27), and the Septuagint translates 'ye shall not make a sisoē of your hair.' There is a passage in Hesychius which, if we follow a correcter reading generally accepted by scholars, may be rendered—

'Sisoē—a certain kind of cropping—the Phaselitae.'

Hence we learn that the term sisoē was current at Phaselis, which lay at the foot of the Solyman mountains, and that it indicated a particular mode of dressing the hair. Bochart identifies sisoē with the Hebrew word *tsitsith*, a lock of hair; and it certainly was the original of the modern word *shusheh*, a name by which the Mussulmans of Egypt still

[1] The translation in our authorized version is corrected in the margin.

designate the tuft of hair they wear on the crown of the head (Lane's Modern Egyptians, ch. 1). Herodotus (3. 8) represents the Arabians who aided Cambyses as he marched through the desert to attack Egypt, as shaving their temples and cutting their hair in a round, after the fashion of Dionusos, and it was no doubt against this idolatrous practice of their neighbours that the Israelites were warned. In the Egyptian pictures we see many examples of the sisoē, and its use by the Solumoi, goes far to prove that they were akin to some of the tribes that dwelt around Palestine.

Haman, the great enemy of the Jews, is called in Esther (8. 3, and 3. 1) the Agagite, and Josephus (Ant. 11. 6. 5) makes him by descent an Amalekite. Now instead of calling him an Agagite or an Amalekite, the Septuagint in Esther (9. 24) calls him the Makedōn. There can be little doubt it was this name of Makedōn which suggested the strange interpolation which appears in the Septuagint, and represents Haman as a Macedonian intriguing to betray Persia into the hands of his countrymen. We need not stop to discuss the question when this story was introduced into the Septuagint; but I think we are justified in drawing the inference that the Amalekites were known by a name answering to the Greek name Makedones, and that the Jews of Alexandria believed there was a connexion between the Amalekites and the people who gave a name to Macedonia. Let us see if it be possible to trace any connexion between the *names* Makedōn and Amalek.

Geshurites and Amalekites were settled from ancient times in the country lying between Judea and Egypt (1 Sam. 27. 8), and a district called Geshur Aram (2 Sam. 15. 8) neighboured on Damascus. The Geshurites of this latter district and their neighbours the Maachath or Maachathites were not expelled by the Israelites when they settled in Gilead (Josh. 13. 13), probably owing to the difficult nature of the country. The country of the Maachathites was called Maachah, and its inhabitants were sometimes called Maachath, the interchange between the

final *h* or *th* being a common one in the Shemitic languages. Fuerst supposes the name Maachah to be a corruption of Malkah; in some copies of the Onomasticon the name is written Malaka; and among the variant readings of 2 Sam. (10. 6 and 8) the MSS. of the Septuagint give us Maakha and Amalēk. Now when we find Geshurites and Amalekites living together south of Palestine, and Geshurites and a people called Maachath living together north of Gilead, and note the connexion which seems to have existed between the names Maachath and Amalek, it is a reasonable hypothesis that in certain localities the Amalekites were called Maachath. The derivation of Makedones from Maachath follows naturally.

It is very difficult to say whence came the Geshurites who are thus ranked with the Amalekites among the earliest inhabitants of Palestine, and to determine whether they were children of Eber or of Lud. Even as early as the time of Abraham the children of Eber may have begun to move southward, but the names of Sheba and Havilah (Gen. 10. 28, 29), among sons of Eber, seem to intimate that some of these tribes were still to be found in the neighbourhood of the northern desert. The earliest settlement of Sheba was, I believe, on the Elanitic gulf; though in the time of Solomon they had no doubt penetrated deeper into Yemen. The course of migration has always set in this direction. The children of Lud followed the children of Eber, for there can be little doubt that the Minaioi of classical geography were the same people as the Maon of Scripture.

We have already stated that this people, the Maon or Mehunim, were probably a race connected with the Amalekites[1]. A people named Magan figure in the Assyrian inscriptions, and appear to have been settled in much the same quarters as the Maon; and as this latter name has its

[1] Pp. 179, 180. The name Menan has been found in hieroglyphic inscriptions, and according to M. Chabas and other Egyptologists denotes the Hykshos or Shepherds.

vowel represented in Hebrew by the guttural *ayin*, we can have little difficulty in identifying the name Magan with Maon. Assur-bani-pal (Sardanapalus) began his description of his first Egyptian campaign thus—'In my first expedition, to Magan and Miluhha I went, &c.' Mr G. Smith's comment on this passage is as follows:—'The name Magan for some land in this region is very ancient, but only known in the cuneiform inscriptions. Miluhha has been thought to be the same as Meroe, the ancient capital of Ethiopia[1].' I would say if Miluhha represents Meroe then Magan in this inscription must represent Egypt. We may conjecture that Magan was the popular name for the Amalekites among the Assyrians[2], and that when the Hykshos got possession of Egypt the name of Magan was transferred to that land, and was occasionally used to designate it in after ages, when the Hykshos had been driven from the country. The scriptural name Mehunim is merely the plural form of Maon, and represents the same people. In the Septuagint both names are represented by Meinaioi. As the Meinaioi are located in Yemen both by Ptolemy and by Strabo, this rendering has been denounced as a blunder, but I think too hastily. The displacement of races during the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. will account for the change of place. As the Edomites were removed from Mount Seir into the Idumea, where the classical geographers place them, so the Maon may have been removed from the country east of Seir southward into Yemen.

Strabo tells us (13. 4. 5) that round Mount Tmolus, in Lydia, dwelt Ludoi, Musoi and Makedones. Pliny (5. 31) mentions two peoples, the Macedones Hyrcani and the Myso-Macedones[3]; the former belonging to the conventus of Smyrna and the latter to that of Ephesus. After the dreadful earthquake in the year A.D. 17, which destroyed

[1] History of Assurbanipal, pp. 15, 48.

[2] See p. 137.

[3] Besides these, Pliny (5. 29) mentions the Macedones Cadueni, who probably lived near Cadi on the upper waters of the Hermus.

so many cities of Lydia, the Romans sent relief to the sufferers, and among others to the people called Mosteni and Macedones Hyrcani (Tac. Ann. 2. 47). This people seems to have been the inhabitants of the Hyrcanian plain, lying between Sardis and Thyateira. The Myso-Macedones probably inhabited the upper portion of the valley of the Caicus. Strabo, in passing from Pergamos to Sardis (13. 4. 4, p. 625), speaks of 'Thyateira, a colony of the Makedones, which some peoplè say is the last town of the Musoi.' It is pretty clear from this that the people of Thyateira were called Makedones, but that they were a colony of the Macedones of Europe is most improbable. When a people in Europe had become important, Strabo was in the habit of deriving from them any cognate Asiatic race. Thus he represents the Asiatic Ibēres to be descended from the European, and the Musoi of Asia from those of Europe. The same kind of criticism led him to derive the Macedones of Thyateira from the European tribe whose name the conquests of Alexander had made famous.

Another people living round Mount Tmolus were the Musoi. This people, according to Herodotus (7. 74), were colonists of the Ludoi, and according to Xanthus, the Lydian historian (Strabo, 12. 8. 3, p. 572), they were the selected tenth of the population sent forth as a colony to Mount Olympus. In that neighbourhood the beech-tree grows abundantly, from which circumstance they derived their name, *musos* in Lydiac signifying a beech. The same authority informs us that the language of the Musoi was half Lydian and half Phrygian. Strabo elsewhere (13. 4. 17, p. 631) tells us that in his day the Lydian language was almost extinct even in Lydia, and most of the words handed down as Lydian are certainly Celtic. Musos, the 'Lydian' name for the beech-tree, is probably connected with the Irish word *meas* and Welsh *mes*, acorn-mast. In the Lydian *Empire* the bulk of the population must have been Celtic in origin, though the three *predominant* races were the Musoi, the Ludoi, and the Kares (Herod. 1. 171). The

history of these peoples is extremely complicated, and it may perhaps be doubted whether the story handed down to us by Xanthus be anything but an untrustworthy legend. One of the races conquered by Ramses II, in his campaign against the Kheta, were the Masa, but their identity with the Musoi, though probable, has not yet been satisfactorily established.

Strabo locates the Ludoi round the Mount Tmolus, but the name does not appear in the Homeric poems. According to Herodotus (1. 7) the Ludoi were represented by the people whom Homer calls the Mēones. We have seen[1] that a people called the Maon were settled in the district lying between Palestine and Egypt, and moreover that according to Arabic tradition the Amalekites were the descendants of Lud. Lud and Amalek therefore were probably tribes bordering upon, if not akin to each other. And when we find races bearing the names of Mēones, Ludoi, and Macedones, brought into close connexion on the western coasts of Asia Minor, we can hardly forbear to identify them with the races that bore similar names bordering upon Palestine and Egypt. The distinction which Strabo makes between the Ludoi and the Makedones may be explained on more than one hypothesis. The probability is that Lud was an old name, revived when the Lydian empire began to rise into importance, and adopted as their own by all or nearly all the various tribes that made up the Lydian empire—Musoi, Makedones, Mēones, &c. In the next chapter it will be our part to enquire how the name Macedones spread from the western shores of Asia Minor to the opposite coast of Europe.

Diodorus opens his history with the grand mythus of Osiris. The great Egyptian—god or hero, as the reader choose to call him—was brought up at Nysa in Arabia. He was the son of Kronos and Rhea, their other children being Isis, Tuphōn, Apollōn, and Aphrodite. At Nysa he discovered the vine, and in Egypt reared temples, worked

[1] See pp. 180, 202.

mines, and invented useful implements. Anxious to civilize mankind, and to teach them how to cultivate the vine, and to raise wheat and barley, he resolved on a great expedition. And first he left the government in the hands of his wife, Isis; appointing Heraklēs to command his troops, Hermes to be chief counsellor, Bousiris to govern the parts towards Phoinikē and the sea, and Antaios the parts towards Aethiopia and Libya. These arrangements made, he set forth in company with his brother, whom the Greeks called Apollōn, having vowed not to cut his hair till his return to Egypt.

He took with him as his fellow-soldiers his sons Anoubis and Makedōn, and also Pan, to whom the city Chemmis is consecrated; also Marōn to attend to the cultivation of the vine, and Triptolemos to attend to the cultivation of wheat and barley. Thus accompanied, he proceeded through Arabia to India and thence to Europe, passing the Hellespont, and killing Lycurgus king of Thrace, who opposed him. He then ordered Marōn to build Maroneia, and having made Makedōn king of Macedonia, and intrusted the agriculture of Attica to Triptolemos he returned to Egypt. Diod. I. 15, &c.

We cannot be far wrong in supposing that the mythus, as thus dressed up, was the invention of the Greeks of Alexandria in the second or third century B.C. Its details show an intimate acquaintance with the country. Bousiris was a town at one of the seven mouths of the Nile, which at one time served as a kind of head-quarters to the Egyptian militia, known as the Hermotybian, and Antaeopolis was a town of Upper Egypt where was a temple to Antaeus, whose worship was introduced from Libya. The Alexandrian school, or at least some of its members, seem to have held that the Greek divinities Apollōn and Dionusos came, mediately or immediately, from Egypt, and that they were first introduced to the notice of the Greeks by the foreign settlements formed in Thrace. Such views are very similar to those we meet with in early Greek litera-

ture. The name of Maron occurs in the Odyssey (9. 197). The precious wine, with which Odusseus circumvented the Cyclops, was given him by

> 'Marōn, son of Euantheus,
> Priest of Apollōn, who o'er Ismaros kept watch.'

Maroneia, a city of that ancient people the Cicones, lay on the sea-coast of Thrace, not far from the lake Ismaris, and was celebrated for its wines and its worship of Dionusos. Dionusos, Herodotus tells us (2. 144), was merely the Greek name of Osiris, and so generally was the identity acknowledged that in bilingual inscriptions the same individual is called in Phoenician Obed-Osir, i.e. servant of Osiris, and in Greek Dionusios, i.e. one belonging to Dionusos. Isis. in like manner, answered to the Greek Dēmētēr, and statues of Dēmētēr are still extant, surrounded with the attributes of the Egyptian goddess. It is also clear that in Egyptian speculation the Makedones proper were looked upon as an eastern people. Views not altogether dissimilar were held by the Jews who wrote the Septuagint; and Josephus certainly considered the Makedones of the Septuagint to be Amalekites.

The mention of India need not lead us to reject the story incontinently as an ignorant and stupid invention. The early notices of Dionusos generally connect him with this eastern land, and on the black obelisk we find a people named Musri (Egyptians) leading the two-humped or Bactrian camel, and bringing tribute to Shalmaneser. The occurrence of the name Musri on this monument may, however, admit of another explanation, and one which dispenses with the necessity of assuming that there was ever an Egyptian colony in India. The Assyrian *mizir* signifies a border, a frontier-land, &c., and Musri may possibly signify the men of the western *mizir* when applied to the Egyptians, and the men of the eastern *mizir* when applied to the races living east of Mount Zagros, the district lying between the two races so called Musri being considered as specially the home of the Shemitic races.

But we must not indulge too much in these speculations. We are playing with turbid waters, and many a hypothesis will have to be abandoned before we can make these floating notions crystallize into history.

Herodotus (2. 102, &c.) mentions an Egyptian king named Sesōstris. He tells us Sesōstris fitted out a fleet and subdued the tribes living on the Eruthraian Sea (the Persian Gulf), and then returning to Egypt fitted out another expedition and carried his arms not only over Asia, but also into Thrace, where he conquered the Thrēkes and the Skuthai. In the countries he conquered he erected *stelai* as symbols of his conquests, and some of these Herodotus had seen—one in Palestinian Syria, and others in Asia Minor. Modern inquirers would recognize in Sesōstris the second Ramses, and his name certainly appears carved on the rocks in the gorge whereby the Litany escapes seaward through the defiles of Mount Lebanon. I would rather consider Sesōstris to represesent Egyptian conquerors in the abstract. Manetho, as we shall see, confounded the expulsion of the Hykshos, the Exodus, and the defeat of the peoples 'of the Sea' in the time of Menephtha, and a foreigner was not likely to be more discriminating in such matters. Attempts have been made to trace the *name* of Sesōstris in the regnal lists of the Pharaohs, but not, I think, satisfactorily.

Diodorus (1. 53, &c.) calls the great conqueror Sesoōsis. He makes him overrun India 'to the Ocean,' found the nation of the Colchi, and at last fix in Thrace a limit to his conquests. Josephus (Contra Apion. 1. 15), quoting Manetho, calls him Sethōsis, and represents him as brought back from his career of conquest by the machinations of his brother Armais, who is no other than the Danaus of the Greeks. I make no attempt to trace the origin of these names, or to translate these stories into history.

The story of Typhon was known to the Greeks before the time of Homer[1]. Bochart treats it as a mythus

[1] Vide p. 35.

suggestive of history. According to Apollodorus (1. 6. 3) the rebel brother of Osiris was driven from Caucasus and buried in the great bog which stretched west of the Egyptian Delta. Herodotus (3. 5) tells us that Syria, from Phoinikē to Kadutis, belonged to the Suroi; from Kadutis to Jēnusos to the Arabs, and again to the Suroi from Jēnusos to the Serbonitic lake 'in which, the report is, Tuphōs is hidden.' According to Plutarch (Is. and Osir. 31), Typhon managed to escape, and afterwards begat two sons, Hierosolymus and Judaeus. Like most other mythical fables this mythus appears to have changed its character at different periods. It may have been originally suggested by the return of the Philistines from Caphtor, whither they may have been carried by some of the Pharaohs of the Old Monarchy.

We have stated that in his history of Egypt Manetho mixed up together the expulsion of the Hykshos, the Exodus of the Israelites, and the defeat of the peoples 'of the Sea,' who on two occasions invaded Egypt during the nineteenth dynasty. According to this historian the shepherd-people who went from Egypt to Jerusalem were expelled by Tethmosis (Jos. Contra Apion. 1. 15). There is reason to believe that Thothmes II, who in all probability was the Tethmosis of Josephus, was the Pharaoh that expelled not the shepherds but the Israelites; and we all know that it was the Jews and not the shepherds that built Jerusalem. Elsewhere (Ib. 1. 26) Josephus represents Manetho as stating that the Jews invaded Egypt with many myriads of people, and were afterwards driven to Judea, when they built a temple at Jerusalem, and that a host of lepers and other unclean persons were expelled with them; and he connects with this blundered legend the name, not of Tethmosis, but of Amenophis. Now Amenophis is generally considered to be the Greek corruption of Menephtha, the name of the Pharaoh in whose reign the peoples 'of the Sea' first attacked Egypt. As Manetho lived some thousand years after the events he is referring

to we need not be surprised at these blunders; nor at their being generally followed by classical writers, when we remember his great authority as the historian of Egypt.

The fact that Manetho confounded the wars of Menephtha with the events of the Exodus, may I think account for the late date which, as we gather from Josephus (Contra Apion. I. 26), the Egyptian historian assigned to the Exodus. His views on this subject were for the most part adopted by the Rabbinical writers, and his influence is clearly traceable in the account which Diodorus gives us in the well-known passage (40. 3), viz. that there was a great pestilence in Egypt occasioned, as the people thought, by the rites and sacrifices which a mixed multitude of foreigners had introduced into the country; that the strangers were expelled, and the noblest of them went, 'as some say,' to Greece and other places under the conduct of Danaus and Cadmus, but that the greater part were led by Moses to the country called Judea, where he built Jerusalem and a great temple, &c. Most German critics maintain opinions on these matters which approximate to the Rabbinical, and they generally make Ramses II the Pharaoh who expelled the Israelites. This hypothesis accounts for the district round Goshen being called the land of Rameses (Gen. 47. 11), and for one of the 'treasure-cities' being called Raamses (Exod. I. 11). But I find it impossible to reconcile this hypothesis either with the chronology of Scripture, or with any reasonable view of early Greek history. If Ramses II were the Pharaoh of the Exodus, we must assign him a date far higher than any Egyptologist has yet considered to belong to him.

The inscription which Mariette discovered on the tomb of Ahmes, the Egyptian sea-captain, proves that it was Ahmes (Amosis), the first Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty, that took Avaris, and drove the Hykshos to the borders of Palestine. By his conquest of Avaris (Zoan) Amosis must have been brought into close contact with the Israelites in Goshen. This Pharaoh had a son named Rames, who was

certainly an officer of high rank and position, and it has been conjectured that he was made governor of the new frontier, and therefore of the district in which Goshen lay. Canon Cook considers Rames to be a varied form of Rameses. If this be so, the occurrence of the names in Gen. 47. 11[1] and Exod. 1. 11 can be explained as satisfactorily on the hypothesis we are dealing with, as on that we have already examined. It has been remarked that the phrase 'there arose up a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph,' is used with singular propriety to indicate the Pharaoh Ahmes; and to no other Pharaoh is it so applicable, certainly not to Ramses II.

The Pharaoh Ahmes was succeeded by two Pharaohs, the latter of whom was named Thothmes I. He left two sons, who reigned successively over Egypt with the titles Thothmes II and Thothmes III. Canon Cook has given weighty reasons for the conclusion that Thothmes II was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. As the 'new king,' or in other words the Pharaoh, Ahmes, began the oppression (Exod. 1. 9), and as the oppression can hardly have lasted much less than a century, for Moses was eighty years old when he led forth the Israelites, the place held by Thothmes II in the regnal list agrees with that which would be assigned to the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

We have assumed Avaris to be the same place as Zoan. It seems to me that De Rougé has established their identity beyond a doubt. On the site which is generally assigned to Zoan inscriptions have been found in which the place is called Hā-ouar (Rev. Arch. 1861, p. 108), and Avaris is evidently the same name Graecized. The name Hykshos, as Josephus tells us, meant the shepherd-kings (Contra Apion. 1. 14), and the hieroglyphic term *hyk* signifies a king, and the Coptic *shos* a shepherd. There can be little doubt that these Hykshos were a branch of the Amalekites,

[1] The fact that Jacob was located 'in the land of Rameses' need not disturb us; Moses would naturally call the land by the name familiar to himself and his contemporaries.

and from the inscription that Mariette discovered in the tomb of the Egyptian admiral, we learn that after the capture of Avaris the Pharaoh Ahmes pursued them to the very borders of Canaan. In the time of Moses this people must have dwelt in the desert Et-Tih, and in the country immediately south of the mountain of the Amorites (Deut. 1. 20), in after times called the hill-country of Judah. When Thothmes III entered upon one of his northern campaigns he took the fortress of Sharuhana, which had been constructed by the ruler of Katatu[1], and was probably the Sharuhen of the tribe of Simeon (Josh. 19. 6). Herodotus (3. 5) locates Suroi as far south as Kadutis, then Arabs from Kadutis to Jēnusos, and Suroi again from Jēnusos to Egypt. Kadutis, which was not much less than Sardis, was no doubt the Egyptian Katatu, and I would say almost as certainly the Gaza of classical geography. The country Herodotus assigned to the Arabs was probably in the time of Moses occupied by some branch of the Hykshos, or Amalekites.

Whatever throws light on the peculiarities of this ancient people must be interesting. Some years back Captain Burton exhumed at Zoan certain sphinxes, with a type of countenance widely different from that of the ancient Egyptians, and the later excavations of Mariette have brought to light other colossal statues of a like character. The French antiquary thus describes their features (Rev. Arch. 1861, p. 105): 'Les yeux sont petits, les joues sont grosses en même temps qu'osseuses, le menton est saillant et la bouche se fait remarquer par la maniere dont elle s'abaisse aux extrémités.' According to Wilkinson (Modern Egypt 1. 409) the peasantry of the neighbourhood have peculiar features, and, if we may trust Mariette, their features resemble those of the sphinxes found at Zoan (Rev. Arch. 1861, p. 106). Many circumstances lead us to infer that the eastern parts of the Delta were peopled by a Shemitic race; and we might expect that when the Hykshos

[1] Vide Dr. Birch's paper, Arch. 35, p. 117.

were driven from Avaris, the peasantry would be still left in the neighbourhood to till and cultivate the land.

The statement that Avaris was the same place as Zoan may require explanation. A place called Hā-Ouar is mentioned in certain papyri, and was unquestionably the Avaris of the Greeks. It must have existed long before the time of Abraham, for on a colossal statue which Capt. Burton first exhumed, there is engraved the name of a Pharaoh of the sixth dynasty. The Zoan that was built seven years after Hebron was probably an entrenched camp adjoining to Avaris, where the Hykshos king yearly mustered his army, and distributed to them their annual rations. *Zaan* (Isa. 33. 20) meant a tabernacle or fixed tent, and *Zaanannim* was the name of the Kenite camp in Naphtali (Jos. 19. 33; cf. Judges 4. 11). The Hebrew form of Zaan and of the first syllable of Zaan-annim differ merely in the vowel points from the Hebrew form of Zoan, which may therefore have well signified a camp. Owing to the Shemitic population, which the Hykshos introduced into the neighbourhood, the Shemitic name may have gradually prevailed, and at length eclipsed the old Egyptian name of Avaris.

It has been clearly shown that Avaris was held in quiet possession by the thirteenth dynasty, and other native dynasties which succeeded seem to have had their dominion more or less recognized there at a later period. The disturbed state of the country during some of these dynasties may have afforded the Hykshos an opportunity of surprising Memphis. The surprise probably took place early in the eighteenth century B.C. Till then the Hykshos seem to have confined themselves to their camp at Zoan, on the eastern bank of the river. What were the relations that existed between the Hykshos and the Egyptians before the seizure of Memphis it is difficult to say. The Hykshos may have been allowed to settle at Zoan in order to strengthen a weak frontier, and it would appear from the language of Josephus that the strangers were expected to act as a kind

of barrier against the inroads from the north, and more especially against the Assyrians. They may thus have been permitted to occupy a portion of the pastoral district east of the Nile, as the Israelites were at a later period. We know that the shepherd life was distasteful to the Egyptians, and they may have given up the grazing lands to the strangers, and confined themselves to the cultivated lands which the waters of the Nile made so productive. Salatis appears to have been the name of the shepherd-king that seized upon Memphis, and the names of several of his successors have come down to us. The dynasty, we may reasonably conclude, lasted from the beginning of the eighteenth century B.C. to about the middle of the fifteenth century B.C., that is for some 300 or 400 years.

The period of the Hykshos settlement at Zoan seems often to have been confounded with the shepherd-dynasty, and we may thus explain the different periods which have been assigned to the Hykshos rule in Egypt. Memphis was probably taken at the beginning of the eighteenth century B.C., and the shepherds expelled from Egypt in the fifteenth century B.C. The Israelites may have been settled in Goshen soon after the capture of Memphis, and may have remained there undisturbed till Amosis took Avaris, for there is every reason to believe that the Pharaohs who favoured the Israelites were dominant in the country till the 'new king arose over Egypt which knew not Joseph.' Arabic tradition, as may be gathered from Abulfeda, made this new king to be the one who restored the line of the native Pharaohs, and I believe that this Arabic tradition was in substantial agreement with Egyptian history. Egyptologists are now pretty well agreed that the accounts of the havoc wrought by the shepherds have been exaggerated. Magnificent works erected under the Old Monarchy are still extant, and show that the Hykshos were not the ruthless destroyers they are sometimes represented to have been. But they appear to have been zealous propagandists of a new faith, and therefore we can understand how they

came to be charged with the destruction of temples and the violation of sanctuaries. While Arba was propagating the worship of Anuka at Hebron, the Shepherds were no less busy in promoting the worship of Sutekh in Egypt. In all respects they seem to have imitated the Egyptians. They adopted their titles, and imitated, though with modifications, even their style of art. We need not therefore feel surprised at finding Egypt, after the expulsion of the Shepherds, differing so little from what it was under the earlier native dynasties.

If we suppose that Salatis took Memphis soon after the year 1900 B.C., and that the Exodus took place in the first half of the fourteenth century B.C., we shall have time enough for the 430 years occupation of Goshen by the Israelites, and a chronology elastic enough to admit the long periods claimed by certain Egyptologists for some of the dynasties of the old monarchy. We must always remember that it is only with respect to some of these dynasties that we have evidence to guide us, either documentary or monumental. From the sixth to the twelfth dynasty, and from the thirteenth to the shepherd-dynasty we have to work our way through a wilderness of difficulty, and we cannot put much reliance on results obtained from such unsatisfactory premisses. But we can hardly suppose that the Old Monarchy was founded later than the Phoenician settlements on the Mediterranean, and the inhabitants of Tyre claimed for their city an antiquity of not less than 2700 years.

An argument has been raised in favour of the almost indefinite antiquity of the Egyptian people from the high civilization which prevailed at the commencement of the Old Monarchy. But this fact should not mislead us. The post-diluvians were heirs of a civilization which originated before the Deluge; and hieroglyphic inscriptions that astonish us by their immense antiquity may have been specimens of a mode of writing handed down from antediluvian times, modified, it may be, by the circum-

stances of the locality. We know that the antediluvian man exercised his inventive faculties just as freely as his descendants of the present day exercise theirs, and some such system as the hieroglyphic would almost necessarily have been invented to meet the requirements of a people that certainly were neither incapable nor incurious.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conquest of Thrace by the Teukroi and Musoi; races settled in the conquered district in the time of Homer: Thrēkes, Kikones, Paiones, &c. — Invasion of the district by the Temenidai in the eighth century B C.; races immediately affected by this invasion: Pieres, Elumoi, Paiones, &c., the Elumoi, the Makedones proper; gave a name to the kingdom founded by the Temenidai; called by Thucydides Troēs or Trojans; perhaps connected with the Amalekites. — The Odomantoi and Agraioi at the sources of the Strymon, Shemitic races; when they were introduced into Europe uncertain; Agraioi found in countries further westward. — Paiones passed into the basin of the Danube; known to the Romans as Pannonii; the Musoi (Moesi) also settled on the Danube; and near them the Dardanioi. — Traces of the Phoenician Kitioi among the intrusive tribes; connexion between this Phoenician tribe and the Trojans. — Tribes that returned to Asia after the age of Homer; the Briges passed from the Axius to the Troad and founded the Lesser Phrygia; often confounded with the ancient Trojans; the Thunoi, Bithunoi and Maido-Bithunoi also passed into Asia and founded Bithynia; called by Xenophon the Thrēkes of Asia. — Supremacy of Troy, whence it originated; the Asiatic races that acknowledged this supremacy. — The Amazons; their wars with the Trojans, the Lycians, and the Athenians; founded the nation of the Sauromatai or Northern Medes; Median tribes in Europe: the Maidoi, Krobuzoi or Croats, and the Sigunnai on the Danube; Sigunnoi in Asia; the Makrokephaloi or Makrōnes a tribe of Sigunnoi; Sigunoi in Egypt. — The Trōes or men of Troy Lycians in origin; the Lycians connected with Crete and Attica; subdued the Solumoi; the Solumoi probably Agagi or Amalekites. — Relations between the Trōes and the Teukroi; both Pelasgoi or ancient Greek tribes. — The races settled in Thrace by the Teukroi and Musoi remained undisturbed for some five centuries; exerted a marked influence on Greek civilization.

The Kadmeioi, a Shemitic people, connected with the Paiones, Agraioi, &c.; settled first in Euboea, afterwards in Thrace and Thebes; expelled from Thebes by the Argives, and driven into Illyricum; another division of Kadmeioi driven from the Theban town of Tanagra by the Boeotians; took refuge in Attica; were known as the Gephuraioi; the Agraioi on the Achelous another branch of this people. — The ancient mythus in the Theogony which assigns to Agraios, Telegonos, and Latinos a supremacy over the Tursēnoi of Latium; the name Tursēnoi or Tyrrheni; according to Greek antiquaries this name meant the tower-builders, Greek not Italian in origin, and may have been first used to distinguish the civilized Pelasgoi of Greece from the rude races living in the forest districts. — The Tursenoi settled early in Italy; fell into decay before the Theogony was written;

regained their importance when the Rasenna of Lydia settled among them — Telegonos probably symbolizes the early Telkhines of Greece. Niebuhr's notion that the Turnus of Virgil symbolized the early Tursenoi; if it be admitted, we may conclude that the legends on which Virgil framed his Æneid had a basis in history.

In the last chapter I touched upon the history of races which had relations more or less intimate with Egypt and with Palestine. In the present chapter I shall endeavour to bring under critical notice the history of races which seem to have more directly felt the influence of another ancient people, one that has left few or no monuments behind it, and whose very existence has been the subject of doubt and speculation. It requires some moral courage to speak of Trojan conquests in an inquiry which professes to be historical; but when we find a historian like Thucydides giving the name of Trojans (Trōes) to races which in his day were still extant, we may be forgiven if we seek to ascertain with what significance he used the phrase, and what authority he had for the use of it. The genius of Homer, at the same time that it made the name of Troy illustrious, threw round it a halo of imagination that almost bewilders criticism, and makes it difficult to separate history from poetry, truth from fiction. I think, however, that by a careful and wary criticism we may make out a few facts that will help us onward to right conclusions.

Of the four great military expeditions which Herodotus (7. 20) seems to have considered to be the earliest that came within the scope of history, the first was that of the Teukroi and Musoi[1], when, sometime before the Trojan War, they passed the Bosphorus, conquered all the Thrēkes, and penetrated westward to the Ionian sea, and southward to the Peneus. From the district thus conquered came all the European allies of Priam—Thrēkes, Kikones, Paiones, &c., and it is strange that so little attention has been drawn to an event, which for more than a thousand years left its mark on the geography of Europe. The subject is one that

[1] The other three were the Greek expedition against Troy, the Scythian inroad into Asia, and the expedition which Darius led against this people.

deserves investigation, and as a first step in the inquiry we will throw a rapid glance over the history of the three last-mentioned races. We begin with the Thrēkes.

The Thrēkes, who were the allies of Priam, came from Ainos (Il. 4. 520), and Ainos lay at one of the outlets of the Hebrus. In the inner parts of the basin of this river the classical writers locate certain barbarous tribes—Bēssoi, Satrai, &c., to whom they more particularly assign this name of Thrēkes. It would seem that in the time of Homer these or cognate tribes occupied the whole district to the coast, an inference which is confirmed by the topography of the neighbourhood. Strabo tells us (7. 6. 1, p. 319) that *bria* in the Thracian language signified a town, and in corroboration he mentions the names Selubria the town of Selus, Menebria so called from Mena who built it, Mesēmbria and Poltuobria the ancient name of Ainos. This name of Poltuobria would alone suffice to prove that genuine Thrēkes once lived at the mouth of the Hebrus. Possibly Poltuobria was the name by which the town was known by the Thracian tribes in the neighbourhood, and Ainos the name it took from the branch of the Hebrus on which it stood. Ainos occurs elsewhere as a river-name in classical geography.

The Kikones are represented by the classical geographers as living in the neighbourhood of the lake Ismaris (Herod. 7. 109), on the coast west of the Hebrus. Their principal town was Marōneia, which was said to have derived its name from a companion of Osiris[1]. The requirements of the legend would be satisfied by supposing either that the Kikones were settled in Europe by Egyptian kings at a very early period, or that they were first carried by them into Asia Minor, and then at a later period passed over into Thrace as part of the Teucrian expedition. The Kikones were devoted to the worship of Dionusos, and their country was celebrated for the excellence of its wines (Od. 9. 209). It was doubtless from this people that their

[1] See above, p. 207.

neighbours the Thrēkes borrowed their worship of Dionusos. In the country of the Satrai was a lofty mountain, on the top of which stood a temple dedicated to this god. The management of the temple was in the hands of certain Bēssoi (Herod. 7. 111), and the Bēssoi are described by Strabo (7. 5. 12) as one of the most numerous of the Thracian tribes[1]. Further south were tribes that were no less certainly Thracian, so that the Thrēkes seem to have overlapped the Kikones, who may be considered merely as an intrusive race settled within their borders.

The Paiones, according to Homer, came from the banks of the 'widely flowing Axius' (Il. 21. 141). Several distinct races may have been included under the name of Paiones, but I think it probable that they were all intrusive races, who had gained the districts they lived in under the guidance of the Trōes, or at least held them under Trojan protection. The origin of the name is doubtful, but the races that bore it were probably of Shemitic origin, or at least closely connected with Shemitic races. I think we cannot err in supposing that, according to the geography of Homer, the whole coast-district from the Hellespont to the Peneus was mainly occupied by three races—the Thrēkes, the Kikones, and the Paiones. The causes which disturbed this arrangement were the Greek colonies, which a few centuries afterwards began to dot the coast of the Aegean; and more particularly the invasion of the Tēmenidai, and the foundation by them of the kingdom of Macedonia.

It was about the year 800 B.C.[2] that the Tēmenidai from

[1] Brugsch considers that the squat figures so often found in Egypt, and generally supposed to represent Typhon, are really representatives of the Arabian god Bas or Bes, or in other words of Dionusos; vide Hist. d'Egypte, pp. 32 and 125 [English ed. 1881, I. 136, 245]. If Bas be the Arabian name of the god, then Bēssoi may well signify the men of Bas or Dionusos. Can the name of the Thracian tribe, the Satrai, have any connexion with that of this god's attendants—viz. the Satyri. The god Besa had an oracle in the Thebaid (Amm. Marc. 19. 12). Satyrus was the name of certain kings of Bosporus.

[2] Alexander, son of Amyntas, who succeeded his father soon after the year

Argos landed on the coast, drove the Pieres from the Peneus to the country beyond the Strymon, and expelled a portion of the Paiones. The strangers gradually established themselves on the Axius, and got possession of the coast district called Mygdonia, inhabited by the Edones, and lying between the Axius and the Strymon (Thuc. 2. 99). The Tēmenidai claimed to be Herakleidai, and were probably one of the Dorian tribes which overran the Peloponnesus. They appear to have spoken a rude Doric dialect, which had affinities with the Aeolic and the Latin. Herodotus, though he imperfectly appreciated their history, looked on them as a Doric people (1. 56).

That the Pieres expelled from the Peneus were connected with the Teucrian expedition may, I think, be inferred from the legend, which represented Aeneas as having founded a town near the Macedonian Olympus (Strabo 13. 1. 53, p. 608). I think that a like connexion existed between the Trojans and the people who inhabited the neighbouring district of Elimeia. Strabo (7. 7. 8, p. 326) gives the name to the hilly country stretching from Pieria to the Pindus, and which was also known as the Upper Macedonia. Thucydides (2. 99) seems to have looked on the inhabitants of this district as having an especial claim to the name Makedones. He says, 'These Makedones,' i.e. those whom he had just mentioned as having established themselves on the coast, 'subdued other districts, Anthemous, Krēstonia, and Bisaltia, and a large portion of the country of the Makedones proper (Makedonōn autōn), but the whole is called Makedonia.' There seems to be a close connexion between the name Elimeia and that of the Elumoi, who were driven from Southern Italy by the Oinōtroi (Dion. 1. 22), and who probably took refuge in Sicily, for it was the usual asylum

500 B.C., was, according to Herodotus (8. 139), the seventh king of Macedonia. This would fix the commencement of the dynasty early in the seventh century. But later writers add four names to the regnal list, and it is likely that the kingdom was not established till some time after the invasion. I think then we may safely follow Clinton in assigning the invasion to about the year 800 B.C.

of refugees from Italy, and we find Elumoi settled in that island. These Sicilian Elumoi, Thucydides (6. 2) represents as Trojans (Trōes), and there are various legends respecting them, differing, as we might expect, in detail, but all agreeing in giving the Sicilian Elumoi a Trojan origin. I think it is, on the whole, a fair inference that the people inhabiting Elimeia were one of those races which acknowledged the supremacy of Troy, and, moreover, that they gave to the kingdom established by the Temenidai its name of Makedonia, just as the Welshmen handed over their name of Britons to the English race that supplanted them.

We have seen[1] that various tribes of Makedones settled round Mount Tmolus in Lydia, and we may conjecture either that Makedones settled in Thrace at the same time that they settled in Lydia, or that the Teukroi carried the Lydian Makedones with them when they invaded Thrace. But it is not easy to say why the European Makedones should take the name of Elumoi. We have seen reason to believe[2] that Makedones was a name sometimes given to the Amalekites, and the story of Haman (Esther 3. 1) shows us that the Amalekites (Agagites) in his day occupied a prominent position in Elam. Is it speculating too curiously to suppose that the Amalekites of Elam may have been brought first to Mount Tmolus, and then have carried with them the name of Elam, as the tide of immigration passed into Europe under Trojan guidance?

Homer, as we have seen[3], located the Paiones on the Axius, and Thucydides (2. 99) represents the Temenidai as conquering a *small* portion of their territory. In after ages the Paiones were settled on the Strymon, and on this river Darius found them (Herod. 5. 13) at the close of the sixth century B.C. We may conjecture that they were driven from the Axius by some of the later aggressions of the Temenidai. They represented themselves as being the

[1] Page 204. [2] Page 201. [3] Page 220.

descendants of the Teukroi of Troy (Herod. 5. 13), and the historian in one place (5. 15) calls them the Siro-Paiones, while Plutarch (De Fluv. 11) calls the Strymon the Palestinian river. At the sources of this river dwelt the Odomantoi, with whom Herodotus (5. 16) couples the Agrianes, on whom they probably bordered. We may quote Aristophanes (Acharn. 157) as our authority for saying that the Odomantoi practised circumcision, and according to the Scholiast there were persons who considered them to be Jews. Though we may question the fact of their being of Jewish descent, I cannot satisfactorily account for their following the custom of circumcision, except on the supposition that they were descendants of Abraham; and this inference is strengthened when we find Strabo (11. 14. 5, p. 528) mentioning a district called Odomantis, and apparently locating it as a Syrian district south of Armenia; inasmuch as the whole of the adjoining country was at one time or other overrun by the descendants of that patriarch. The Agrianes were also called Agraioi according to Steph. Byzantinus (vide Agriai), and he tells us they were settled in Paeonia, between Haemus and Rhodope. Now this name of Agraioi was given by Eratosthenes (Strabo 16. 4. 2, p. 768) to an Arabian tribe which he coupled with the Nabataioi, and there can be little doubt that these two Arabian tribes, the Agraioi and the Nabataioi, represent the Hagarenes and the Nebaioth of Scripture. The Hagarenes and the Nabatheans appear to have been the two great divisions of the Ishmaelite race which occupied the northern desert, and with the first of these the Odomantoi may have been connected. We may reasonably conclude that the Agraioi of Paeonia were descended from the Agraioi of Arabia, and that they were carried into Europe at the same time as the kindred Odomantoi.

In the year 510 B.C., when the Persians entered Thrace, they attacked the Paiones on the Strymon, and subdued their country as far as the lake Prasias. In the stockaded

fortresses, raised upon piles in the midst of this lake, and in the difficult country further westward, the Paiones maintained their ground, and in this district they appear as an independent people as late as the time of Alexander. The name of Paiones seems to have been often applied to the neighbouring tribes, and possibly may have been used as a common name for all the Shemitic races in that part of Thrace. Greek writers generally give this name of Paiones to the people whom the Romans called Pannonii; and notwithstanding the scepticism of Dio Cassius (49. 36) I have myself little doubt that the Paiones and the Pannonii were the same people. When the Paiones first passed into the basin of the Danube we cannot say, but it was probably at the same time that the Musoi migrated into the district to which they gave their name, and which the Romans called Moesia. There were no doubt tribes of various origin in Pannonia when the Romans conquered it. Ptolemy (2. 16) mentions the Arabiskoi as one of the tribes of Lower Pannonia, and both history and the topography of the country show that in it were Celtic settlements. Possibly the name Pannonii may have originated with these Celts and been formed from the name Paiones, just as Damnonii was formed from Damnii (Devon). The dominant race, the Paiones, seem to have strongly impressed their nationality on the neighbouring districts. Tacitus (Germ. 1) represents Germania as surrounded by Galli, Rhaeti, Pannonii, Sarmatae, and Daci, and he seems to have considered the Pannonii to be as distinct a people as the other four he mentions. Elsewhere (ib. 28) he tells us that the Osi on the German side of the Danube spoke the same language as the Aravisci[1] on the Pannonian side, and also (ib. 43) that neither Gothini nor Osi could be Germans, as the former spoke a Gallic and the latter a Pannonian dialect. Startling though the conclusion be, I do not see how we can avoid it, viz. that as late as the second century

[1] The Aravisci of Tacitus were no doubt the same people as the Eravisci whom Pliny (3. 28) mentions as one of the Pannonian tribes.

there was a people settled on the banks of the Danube who spoke a Shemitic dialect.

The great expedition, the consequences of which we are more particularly investigating in the present chapter, was, according to Herodotus (7. 20), undertaken by the 'Teukroi and Musoi.' Under which of these two heads should be ranged the several tribes whose geographical position we have been endeavouring to ascertain is not easy to say. But in the basin of the Danube, east of the people whom the Greeks called Paiones and the Romans Pannonii, were settled a people called the Musoi, or, according to Latin orthography, the Moesi. These Musoi are styled by Dio Cassius and other writers the European, in order to distinguish them from the Asiatic Musoi, who dwelt in the Troad and the neighbouring districts. Strabo (7. 3. 2) asserts that the Musoi on the Danube were Thracians, like the Getai; and tells us they were the ancestors of the Asiatic Musoi. But, as we have already remarked, it was his custom to derive the obscurer races of Asia from races of the same name in Europe who had made themselves famous, and as his statement is directly at variance with that of Herodotus it may be safely disregarded.

What country Homer assigned to his Musoi is a question involved in some obscurity. In the Iliad (2. 858) the Musoi seem to be ranked with certain Asiatic races, but, as Poseidonius remarked (Str. 7. 3. 2, p. 295), they are treated in the opening of the thirteenth book as if they were settled in Europe—

'When Zeus then had brought the Troes and Hector near the ships,
There left he them to have toil and sorrow
Unceasingly; and backward he turned his beaming eyes
Looking away—upon the land of the horse-riding Thrēkes
And of the hand-to-hand fighting Musoi, and of the illustrious Hippēmolgoi
Living on milk and long-lived, the most just of men—
And never again on Troy turned he his beaming eyes,' &c.

When Zeus looked away from Troy he must necessarily have looked away from the neighbouring race of the Asiatic Musoi. The Hippēmolgoi or mare-milkers were of

course the nomade tribes living north of the Danube, and the insertion of the Musoi between them and the Thracians seems to locate the Musoi in the intermediate district, that is in the Moesia of Latin geography. When the Lydian empire arose, the Asiatic Musoi must have risen into importance with it, and we find the two races, the Ludoi and Musoi, coupled together as if they were kindred races of almost equal importance. There really seems reason to believe that Homer used the term Musoi to indicate sometimes the European and sometimes the Asiatic people of that name.

South-west of the European Musoi were a people called Dardanoi (Ptol. 3. 9), whose country must have bordered on the south upon the Paiones and the Makedones (Str. 7. 5. 7). Strabo represents them as being in his day an insignificant tribe, though they must have been once important, for there was a considerable district called after them Dardania and Dardanikē. We have no direct authority for connecting these European Dardanioi with the Trojans, but they bore the same name as the Dardanioi of Mount Ida, the followers of Aeneas (Il. 2. 819), and as Aeneas generally appears in Greek legends as a leader of Trojan emigrants, it is a reasonable conjecture that they were descended from Asiatic Dardanioi who had emigrated under the guidance of one of his family. The earlier legend represented Aeneas himself as destined to reign *in Asia* (vide Il. 20. 178).

The tribes we have hitherto noticed as taking part in the Teucrian expedition were of diverse origin. It is matter of some interest to inquire whether there were among them any of those races which are generally known in Greek literature as the Phoenicians. I think there is reason to believe that Shemitic races *were* mixed up in the great movement of peoples we have been considering.

The isle of Thasos, lying off the coast of Thrace, was said to have been colonized by Thasos, brother of Agenor; and its gold mines, according to Herodotus (6. 47), were worked

by the Phoenicians down to the time when the Greeks settled on the island, an event which probably took place soon after the Temenidai landed in Thrace and founded the kingdom of Macedonia. It is not easy to say when the Phoenicians first got possession of these celebrated mines, but it may be shown very satisfactorily that they were settled on the adjoining coast of Asia before the Trojan war.

Homer locates a people called Kilikes in the neighbourhood of Troy. Their capital was Thebē-under-Plakos (Il. 6. 397), which probably lay near Plakiē, a town situate at the foot of the Mysian Olympus. Their country stretched along the coast to the mouth of the Caicus (Str. 13. 1. 60, p. 612). It was in this district that Telephus the Hērakleid reigned, whose descendant Eurypylus was slain in the midst of his 'Kēteioi' by the son of Achilles (Od. 11. 519). Kilix, according to the well-known mythus[1], was brother of Phoinix; and the Phoinikes may be considered ethnologically the same people as the 'children of Heth,' whose name is closely connected with the Homeric phrase Kēteioi[2]. In the eighth century B.C. the Briges of Macedonia invaded the Troas and founded the Lesser Phrygia. They seem for the most part to have expelled the Kilikes and the Teukroi, for Strabo (13. 1. 63) represents the Kilikes as having disappeared from the plain of Thebe. He also quotes Callisthenes as his authority for saying that part of the expelled Kilikes migrated to Pamphylia (Str. 14. 4. 1, p. 677), where Pamphylia seems to be used in a loose sense to include the neighbouring district of Cilicia. These Kilikes no doubt gave to the valley of the Calycadnus its name of Kētis; the people they drove out appear to have been a Shemitic race. Strabo calls them Suroi or Arimoi (Str. 13. 4. 6, p. 627).

Though the Kilikes disappeared from the neighbourhood of Troy, they left behind them clear traces of their having once dwelt there. On the upper course of the Caicus was an affluent of that river called Musios, or the Mysian water,

[1] Vide Strabo, 13. 4. 28, p. 680.

[2] Vide p. 264.

no doubt from its flowing through a Mysian district; and another stream which flowed by Pergamos and entered the Caicus near its mouth was called Kitios or the Kittian water, indicating no doubt that it flowed through a Kittian or, in other words, a Kilikian district. We have a curious piece of evidence to show that Pergamos was looked upon as a Kittian town as late as the second century B.C. In the treaty between the Jews and the men of Pergamos, alluded to by Josephus (Ant. 14. 10. 22) we find the latter asserting, that 'even in the time of Abramos, who was the father of all the Hebrews, our ancestors were their friends, as we find in public writings.' Here is clearly a reference to Abraham's confederacy with Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner, (Gen. 14. 13) who were 'sons of Heth' (Gen. 23. 20). Pergamos in the time of the Maccabees was a Greek town, but Telephus the Heracleid was its tutelary Hero, and legendary notices of its Kittian origin must have lingered in its neighbourhood. The Jews, who abounded in Pergamos, no doubt turned the attention of the authorities to the passage in the Septuagint which contained the needful information (vide p. 249).

When we find a Phoenician people like the Kilikes brought into close relationship with Troy, we might naturally expect to see them, or races akin to them, mixed up with the tide of invasion which, under Trojan guidance, poured into Europe. Now between the Drave and the Danube ran a mountain range called the Mons Cetius, and at its foot was a town called Citium. We have seen[1] reason to believe that Kitioi was a name by which the Phoenicians distinguished themselves; and we may reasonably conclude that the Mons Citius and the town beside it took their names from the same people that left behind them so many traces of their settlement in the Troad.

Whether the Paiones and the Musoi were carried into the basin of the Danube by the impulse of their first immigration, or driven there in a subsequent age by more

[1] Vide Chap. V, p. 155.

powerful tribes acting in their rear, we have no means of ascertaining. But the derangements occasioned by the invasion of the Temenidai extended far beyond their immediate neighbourhood, and produced results which require careful consideration.

The Brugoi or, as Herodotus (7. 73) in one place calls them, the Briges, inhabited the upper course of the Axius; and in that difficult country long continued to exist as a powerful tribe, for they offered a determined resistance to the Persians (Herod. 6. 45) when they invaded Greece 492 B.C. A portion of them were driven from Emathia (Justin 7. 1), no doubt by the Temenidai; and it was probably the people thus expelled who crossed over into Asia and conquered the Troad (Strabo 12. 8. 3, p. 572). Briges was the same name as Phruges (Herod. 7. 73), in short the Macedonian corruption of the name, just as Bilippos was a Macedonian corruption of Philippos. The district the Briges founded in the Troad was called Phrygia Minor, and it may have been this Celtic people that gave the Celtic name of Evenus to the river which runs into the Aegean north of the Caicus.

The intrusion of the Briges into the Troad, and the foundation of the Lesser Phrygia, gave rise to much ethnological blundering. Strabo tells us (14. 3. 3, p. 665) that the poets, and especially the tragedians, were wont to confound together Troes, Musoi and Ludoi, and the Latin poets use the word Phrygian as if it were synonymous with Trojan. But Strabo (12. 4. 4, p. 564) quotes as a proverbial saying,

'Distinct the boundaries of the Musoi and the Phruges!'

and in the poems of the Homeric cycle the distinction between the Trojans and the Phrygians is clearly marked. Priam (Il. 3. 186) led his Trojans to the aid of the Phrygians, Mugdōn and Otreus, when they warred with the Amazons on the Sangarius, and evidently looked on his allies as a distinct people; and when Venus reveals herself to Anchises in order to encourage the awe-stricken youth, she tells him with ready mendacity,

> 'why likenest thou me to the Immortals?
> I am a mortal and a woman was my mother!
> And Otreus was my father, of illustrious name—if thou hast heard of it,
> Who governs the whole of well-cityed Phrygia.
> But I know well both your tongue and ours
> For a Trojan nurse brought me up in her house, and entirely did she
> Rear me as a little child, when she had received me from my dear mother;
> So even your tongue am I well acquainted with.'
>
> *Hymn to Aphrodite,* 109.

What was the language of Troy it is not easy to say, but we know on the authority of Homer (Il. 4. 437) that the Trojan army consisted of men brought from many lands and speaking various tongues—

> 'So the shout of the Troēs through the wide army rose—
> All indeed had not the same cry, nor the same speech,
> But mixed was the language, and from many lands were the people brought.'

About the same time that the Briges passed over into the Troad, the Thunoi, Bithunoi and Maido-Bithunoi (Str. 7. 3. 2, p. 295) seem to have passed into the country which from them took the name of Bithynia. They were probably driven out of Thrace by Teucrian races some two or three centuries after the Teucrian invasion, and were called Strumonioi (Herod. 7. 75) from the river Strymon, on which they had once dwelt. Thucydides calls this immigrant race the Bithunoi Thrakes (4. 75), and Xenophon calls their country Thrace in Asia (Anab. 6. 2. 17). There cannot therefore be a doubt that the Bithunoi originally came from Thrace; and I think the date we have assigned to the migration is the correct one, for the names Thunoi and Bithunoi are never mentioned by Homer, which could hardly have been the case if these races were in his time settled in Asia. Their settlement in Asia must accordingly have been later than the end of the ninth century B.C., if we adopt the common opinion which assigns Homer to that period. In the course of the eighth century the Temenidai seized upon Emathia, and gradually got possession of the whole lower course of the Axius, driving before them both

Briges and Paiones. The Briges who were thus expelled seem to have crossed over to the Troad, and the Paiones to have retreated northward to the Strymon, and there to have won themselves a new country by the expulsion of the Thunoi and Bithunoi. The Paiones were on the Strymon at the time of the Persian invasion, and indeed maintained themselves on the upper part of that river to a much later period.

From Strabo (12. 3. 3, p. 541) we learn that it was owing to the Thracian immigration that the inhabitants of the Asiatic coast east of the Bosphorus took the name of Bithunoi; and he pointed to the Bithunoi who were still in Thrace, and to Thynias near Salmudessus, to prove the Thracian extraction of these Asiatic Bithunoi. But according to Herodotus it was from the Strymon that the Thunoi and Bithunoi came into Asia. The Thunoi settled on the European side of the Bosphorus, opposite to Bithynia, were probably, like their namesakes in Asia, fugitives flying from the face of the Paiones. They may have found a home on the western as the Asiatic Bithunoi did on the eastern shores of the Propontis.

Hitherto we have confined our inquiries to the great movements of people, which followed the conquest of Thrace by the Teukroi and Musoi, and to the derangements which followed the landing of the Temenidai in the conquered district, some 500 years afterwards. The founding of the kingdom of Macedonia by the Temenidai is a great event in history, and its results in some points of view more important than those which followed the Teucrian invasion. We must not, however, intrude upon the beaten paths of history; we will rather look eastward and see what were the influences Troy was exerting on the races in its own immediate neighbourhood at the time it was carrying its arms westward on the continent of Europe. Homer represents the coast districts of Asia Minor, from the Paphlagones on the Euxine to the Lycians on the Mediterranean, as all more or less subject to, or in alliance with, Troy.

How the Trojans obtained this supremacy we are not told, but we know that confederacies for the purposes of conquest were frequent at this period, and the successful issue of the expedition into Thrace may have given a supremacy to the people that took a leading part in it.

The only people settled eastward of the Troad with whom Homer brings the Trojans into conflict were the Amazons. The early history of this people will be more particularly discussed in the ninth chapter; at present I shall merely refer to the notices respecting them which may be gathered from the Iliad or other Greek sources. Their connexion with the Medes can hardly be doubted; and equally certain is it, that several Median races, Sigunnoi, Maidoi, Krobuzoi, &c., were at an early period settled in Europe, but under what circumstances they were carried there it is difficult to say. There can be no doubt as to the importance of these settlements, or as to their antiquity.

Homer describes the Amazons as a 'match for men,' and to oppose them Priam proceeded to the banks of the Sangarius as the ally of the Phrygian chiefs Otreus and Mugdōn[1] (Il. 3. 189). The Amazons had previously attacked Lycia, for Homer represents them as having been defeated by Bellerophōn (Il. 6. 186), and the defeat must have taken place somewhere in that district. In a later age Herodotus (4. 110) represents them as defeated by the Greeks near the Thermōdon, and as afterwards founding on the Tanais the nation of the Sauromatai, whose women accompanied their husbands to the chase and to war; and he introduces (9. 27) the Athenians as boasting that they repulsed the Amazons when they came from the Thermōdon to invade Attica. Strabo seems to have looked on the Sauromatai as a tribe of Amazons, for on the authority of authors whom he quotes he locates a people called the Amazons

[1] Otreus and Mugdōn personified two ancient Celtic tribes, the Otryans and the Mygdonians. These tribes were settled in the country lying between the Troad and the lake of Nicaea.

north of the Caucasus, though his good sense revolted from the notion that there ever was a nation of women that did not admit men within their borders.

The Russian word *sjevr* means the north, and there can be little doubt that Saur-o-matai meant the northern Matai or Medes, *o* being the connecting vowel[1]. The Latins dropped this vowel, and instead of Sauromatai used the word Sarmatae; and Pliny (6. 7) tells us the Sarmatae were reputed to be descendants of the Medes. In the celebrated inscription at Olbia, which is generally ascribed to the second century B.C., the Sauromatai are represented as settled near the Dnieper; and there were certainly other Median tribes located in Europe. Adjacent to the Paiones were a people called the Maidoi (Thuc. 2. 98), and Aristotle (Hist. Animal. 9. 45) represents the Mons Messapius, in whose forests still roamed the Bonasus[2], as separating the Maidic district from Paeonia. The country of these Maidoi seems to have extended from the sources of the Axius and the Strymon down the valley of the Margus, a tributary of the Danube now called the Morava. Among the tribes who had left Europe for Asia, Strabo (7. 3. 2) enumerates Thunoi, Bithunoi, and Maido-Bithunoi, and as the two former were driven from the Strymon by the Paiones[3], we may infer that some of the Maidoi were at the same time driven from the upper part of the river, and that the mixed people thus forced to emigrate took the name of Maido-Bithunoi.

Strabo (7. 5. 12, p. 317) mentions a people called the Krobuzoi as neighbouring on the Maidoi. He distinguishes between the two races, but there is reason to believe that they were ethnologically connected. The Latins used the term Sarmatae as a general name for the Slavish races; and Ovid in his exile complained that he was driven to the necessity of learning the Getic and Sarmatian tongues (Trist.

[1] As to the proper function of this element, vide Chap. XI, pp. 357–360.

[2] This animal was no doubt the 'Paeonian bull,' which Pausanias (10. 13. 2) speaks of. From his description it must have been a species of bison.

[3] Vide p. 231.

5. 7. 55). The Sarmatian tongue here referred to was probably the language used by the Krobuzoi. As this people have preserved both their language and their ancient name to the present day, it may be worth while to throw a rapid glance over their history.

When tracing the course of the Danube (Ister) Herodotus (4. 49) represents three of its tributaries, Athrus, Noēs and Artanēs, as flowing through the country of the Thrēkes Krobuzoi. Strabo (7. 5. 12) locates the Krobuzoi about Kallatis and Tomi, and therefore agrees with Herodotus in locating them south of the Danube. But Pliny (4. 26) places the Crobyzi beyond the Axiaces, by which name he appears to designate the Dniester, and it would seem that in his time the Crobyzi were settled north of the Danube. There can be little doubt that this people, the Crobyzi, were the Khrōbatoi of the Byzantine historians, and the Croats of modern times. Constantine Porphyrogenitus (De admin. Imper. c. 30) tells us that the Khrōbatoi before they invaded Dalmatia dwelt 'beyond Bagibareia, where are now the Belo-Khrōbatoi,' i.e. the White Croats. Annotators explain Bagibareia to mean the Carpathians, and as these mountains are in part drained by the Dniester, it appears that Constantine agreed with Pliny in the locality he assigned to the Crobyzi. The Croat dialect is said to have a close affinity to the Polish, and Croats and Poles were probably neighbouring tribes for some centuries after the Christian era.

Herodotus (5. 9) mentions a people named Sigunnai as settled in the country stretching from beyond the Danube to the Veneti on the Adriatic. 'As to the country north of this district (Thrace) no one can say with certainty what people inhabit it. But the parts beyond the Ister (Danube) appear to be a boundless desert, and of the people beyond the Ister I can only hear of those whose name is Sigunnai and who wear the Median dress. It is said their horses are shaggy over the whole body, five finger-breadths of hair in depth, and small and flat-nosed and unequal to

carry men, but when yoked in chariots extremely swift; and that the inhabitants accordingly ride in chariots; and that their borders reach nearly to the Enetoi who dwell in Adria. They say they are colonists of the Mēdoi, but how they could be colonists of the Mēdoi I cannot understand, but everything may come to pass in process of time. The Ligues dwelling above Marseilles call traders, and the Cypriots call spears by this name, Sigunnai.' Perhaps we may infer from this passage that a branch of the Saur-o-matai or Northern Medes conducted the trade between the Danube and the west of Europe, so that their specific name Sigunnai came to signify traders in the neighbourhood of Marseilles. Let us compare this statement with a passage written by a Greek geographer some four centuries later.

After noticing the barbarous tribes which dwell about the Caspian and the Caucasus, Strabo (11. 11. 8, p. 520) proceeds thus :—'But the Siginnoi live like the Persians, and use ponies small and shaggy, which are unable to carry a rider; but they yoke them four abreast and they are driven by women who are trained to it from childhood, and the best driver marries whomsoever she will. They say that certain of them study to appear as long-headed as possible, and have their foreheads brought forwards so as to project beyond their chins.' When Strabo wrote this account of the Siginnoi, he must have had before him the passage I have quoted from Herodotus, or the statement of some other writer containing the substance of it. But Strabo was a native of Amasea on the Iris, and could hardly fail to have also some independent knowledge of this Asiatic people. There really seem to be some grounds for the conclusion that there were two tribes, one on the Danube and the other in Asia Minor, both of whom were called Sigunnoi and claimed connexion with the Medes.

Strabo mentions that certain of the Siginnoi studied to be as long-headed as possible; and on the southern coasts of the Euxine were settled a people called the Macrocephali or Long-heads (Plin. 6. 4). They were, no doubt, though

Pliny distinguishes between the two, the same race as the Makrōnes who neighboured on the Suroi at the river Thermōdon, and who, like the Suroi and the Kolkhoi, practised circumcision (Herod. 2. 104). Now there are Egyptian papyri which mention the Matai as a military body employed for state services, and according to De Rougé they were so employed at a very early period. The Egyptians seem very generally to have quartered their mercenaries in towns by themselves; and Stephanus Byzantinus quotes the Periplus of Ctesias as his authority for saying that there was an Egyptian town named Sigunos, the inhabitants of which were called Sigunoi. As the Periplus of Ctesias professed to be an account of a voyage along the coasts of Asia Minor, it is not unlikely that his attention was called to the Egyptian Sigunoi, by his meeting with Sigunnoi on the southern coasts of the Euxine, and that he considered the Egyptian Sigunoi to have come from that neighbourhood. The Egyptian Matai may have been the same people under another name.

When we note the masculine character assigned to the women of the Sigunnoi, and remember that the Sigunnoi were settled in the very country in which the Amazons are generally located, we may reasonably infer that the customs and habits of the Sigunnoi gave rise to the celebrated mythus respecting these female warriors. The name Sigunnai, which Herodotus gives to the tribe on the Danube, may partly have been the cause why the fable was so generally accepted by the Greeks. It is true that Apollonius Rhodius (4. 320) calls this tribe Sigunoi, but Sigunnai appears to be the more ancient form of the name. It might readily suggest the notion of a commonwealth of women.

We may observe that Strabo (12. 3. 18, p. 548) and Eustathius (Dion. Perieg. 766) both considered the Makrōnes to be the same people as the Sannoi, who under the name of Tzanoi played such an important part in the wars between the Romans and the Persians in the time of Justinian. These Tzanoi, it is generally considered, still exist

in the mountains south-east of Trebizond, but no longer follow the custom which gave them the name of Long-heads. The inhabitants of these mountains still practise circumcision, though they are in religion Christians rather than Mahometans. The custom of circumcision may possibly have been handed down to them from times more ancient than the Mahometan conquest.

The races we have been treating of were probably Median or Slavish in origin. It is difficult to draw any clear line of distinction between the Mede and the Slave in the earlier periods of their history. There was, however, a Phrygian people who seem to have followed the Trojans in their Teucrian expedition, who should not be passed over without notice. The Mugdōn whom Priam assisted against the Amazons was clearly the eponym of the Mygdones who dwelt south of the Troad, and from them the coast district on the opposite side of the Bosporus must have got its name of Mygdonia.

The people whose conquests produced these remarkable changes on the races around them are called by Homer the Troes. Till recent times few scholars interested themselves in investigating the origin of this people, though the hints Homer has left us on the subject are strongly supported by the testimony of extant monuments. The opinion now most favoured—and among others by Mr. Gladstone—is that the Troes were a tribe of Lycians. Their connexion with Lycia seems to be clearly indicated in the Iliad.

In his list of the Trojans and their allies Homer mentions first, the Trōes commanded by Hector; secondly, the Dardanioi commanded by Aeneas; and then proceeds (Il. 2. 824)—

> 'The Troēs who inhabited Zeleia under the last slope of Ida,
> The wealthy people that drank the dark waters of Aisēpos;
> These then the splendid son of Lukaōn commanded,
> Pandaros.'

And after mentioning other races he closes the list with the Lycians led by Sarpēdōn and Glaukos. In the fifth book

(171) when Diomede is scattering death around him, Aeneas exclaims—

> 'Pandaros, where is thy bow and thy winged arrows,
> And thy fame wherewith no one here can vie with thee,
> Nor doth any one in Lukia boast himself to be better than thou;
> Come, send a shaft at that man.'

Pandaros answers that his arrows have been tried in vain (5. 209):

> 'With ill luck from the peg did I take my curved bow
> That day when to lovely Ilion
> I led the Troēs, to pleasure the godlike Hector.'

From these passages we may conclude that Pandaros ruled over a tribe of Trōes living on the Aisēpos, to the east of Troy, and that he was connected in some way with Lycia. Of all the allies he alone is said to have brought Trōes to the defence of Troy, and he figures in the poem rather as the friend of Hector than the subject of Priam. Strabo (13. 1. 7, p. 584) represents the various races of the Troad—Kilikes, Dardanioi, Leleges, &c.—as taking the name of Trōes; but the people of Pandaros must have had a special claim to this title. Strabo (14. 4. 5, p. 665) mentions that Pandaros was worshipped at the Lycian towns of Pinara, and he supposes he was the same as Pandareos 'for they say he also was from Lukia.' Pandaros is mentioned in the Odyssey (20. 67) as having been destroyed by the gods, and his orphan children as having been carried off by the Harpies. The researches of Sir Charles Fellows have shown that these legends were rife in Lycia; and it was from the Lycian town of Xanthus that he brought away the Harpy tomb, now in the British Museum, which represents the Harpies carrying off the daughters of Pandaros. Strabo considered that the Lukioi of the Troad were a people allied to the Lukioi who dwelt near the Carians (12. 8. 4, p. 572) and he thus in some measure strengthens the inference we have drawn from the language of Homer.

We are told by Herodotus (1. 173) that the Lukioi sprang from Crete, and that Sarpēdōn being expelled by Minos

went to the country of the Milyae, as the Solumoi were called, and subdued it. He tells us also that the conquerors were first called Termilai, but that after Lukos, son of Amphion, was driven from Athens by his brother Aegeus, they took the name of Lukioi. The Lycian Glaukos relates in the Iliad (6. 184) how his grandfather Bellerophontēs warred against the Solumoi and the Amazons, and how Proitos, king of Lukia, gave him part of his kingdom. In bilingual inscriptions at Xanthus the inhabitants are styled Lukioi in Greek, and in the native Lycian tongue Termila. At Tlos, a few miles from Pinara, the inhabitants are termed Trooes on the monuments. The poet Panyasis, a contemporary of Herodotus, thus commemorates the four cities of Lycia—Tlos, Xanthos, Pinaros, and Kragos (Steph. Byz. Tremilē):

> 'Here lived the great Tremilos and married his daughter
> The nymph Ogygia, whom they call Praxidika,
> By the silver Sibros (Xanthus river) and the eddying stream,
> Of whom came the death-dealing sons—Tlōos, Xanthos, Pinaros,
> And Kragos—he by his power ravages every land.'

It is hard to unravel these obscure mythi, but the marriage of the mythical Tremilos with Ogygia seems to show that the people whom the Termilai subdued were Agagi or Amalekites, and therefore that the Solumoi were a branch of this people—a conclusion to which we have been already brought by other considerations.

I have hitherto used the name Teukroi as if it merely signified the Trojans. The name is found neither in the Homeric nor in the Hesiodic poems, though Herodotus uses it as a well-known and familiar term, and from his time it has maintained its place in classical literature. There was a town named Gergis lying not far from the supposed site of Troy, whose inhabitants were transplanted by King Attalus, in the second century B.C., to Cyme on the Caicus. This people Herodotus (7. 43) calls 'Gergithes Teukroi,' and he tells us (5. 122) they were remnants of the ancient Teukroi. It seems therefore that there really was a people

named Teukroi living in the Troad down to a comparatively late period, and they may have been a kindred race to the Trōes of Homer. At Miletus there was a race of serfs called Gergithai (Athen. 12. 26), and it is said Miletus was founded by Sarpedon with the permission of the Carians. When the Ionians took Miletus they killed the Carians (Paus. Ach. 2. 6; Str. 14. 1. 7, p. 635; Herod. 9. 97), so we may infer that the Gergithai were descendants of the Cretan followers of Sarpedon, and consequently that the kindred race of the Teukroi came originally from Crete.

In laying before the reader notices of so many various races, I have endeavoured to find something like a thread of connexion by following more particularly the fortunes of *one* tribe—the Troes. With the Troes, the other races, Lukioi, Amazones, &c. were all at one time or other brought into contact, and though there be no ethnological unity to bind them together, we may without much fear of error, assign them to the same historical era. From the fourteenth to the eleventh century B.C. there was a strange aptitude in the races settled on the coasts of the Mediterranean to unite for some common purpose. It certainly was not identity of race that united them, for we have seen[1] that they often spoke different languages, and came from countries widely separated from each other, but the custom of lending themselves out as mercenaries was common among them, and we can therefore understand how the spirit thus engendered would lead them to embark in any project that held out hopes of plunder. If the enterprise were successful, it might in some cases leave a mark behind it, and it is probable that a casual confederacy of this kind gave rise to some of those early empires which appear so suddenly in history, and sometimes disappear almost as suddenly, such as the Cretan, the Trojan, the Lydian, and others.

The enterprises I am alluding to are often confounded

[1] See page 230.

with others to which I have occasionally alluded, but from which they seem to differ in an important particular. The former must be looked upon as the work of military adventurers, the latter as resulting from the movements of races. There are three races generally considered to be Shemitic in origin, which in legendary history are sometimes brought into relation with Greece and Troy, and it is well to clear up our views as to their origin before we enter upon any investigation of their history. I shall give them names familiar to the scholar, and call them respectively the Arimoi, the Ogygians, and the Kadmeans.

The name of Arimoi is found in Greek literature connected with different localities, stretching from the seacoast of Cilicia to the neighbourhood of Colchis[1]; and Leuko-Suroi or White Suroi, which appears to have been the name given to the Arimoi at a later period, was the designation of a people who lived on the river Thermodon. What circumstances led to the settlement of Arimoi in Asia Minor I cannot say. But when we find their settlements reaching to the neighbourhood of Colchis, which was certainly an Egyptian colony, it seems to be a reasonable conclusion that they were brought into Asia Minor by one of the Egyptian Pharaohs. The hypothesis which appears to me encumbered with fewest difficulties is that which identifies them with the Caphtorim of Scripture, and supposes the Casluhim of Scripture to represent their neighbours the Colchians. The Arami of Scripture reached from Aram-Naharaim, that is, from the upper waters of the Tigris and Euphrates to Damascus. The language spoken by them in the time of Jacob seems to have been intelligible to a Jew, though even at that early date it must have been distinguished by peculiarities of dialect (Gen. 31. 47). Elihu, the friend of Job, lived near Damascus, and was 'of the kindred of Ram.' His speech exhibits many Aramaisms, and is thus distinguished from that of the other speakers. Aramaic seems gradually

[1] See above, p. 192.

to have spread, till in some form or other it was spoken over the whole of the Northern Desert. What language the Arimi spoke when the Egyptians removed them into Asia Minor, may be open to question. Their removal must have taken place at a very early period, perhaps before Aramaic peculiarities of dialect had manifested themselves.

The term Ogygian is used by the Greek tragedians and their contemporaries in the sense of primeval, but when used by writers born in or otherwise connected with the East, it generally has some reference to a remote eastern, or to speak with precision, to an Amalekitish antiquity. Josephus (Ant. 1. 10. 4) gives the name Ōgugēs to a large oak at Hebron, which he elsewhere tells us (Bell. Jud. 4. 9. 7) was supposed to have existed since the creation of the world. The magnificent tree which goes by the name of Abraham's oak has been looked upon as its representative. The Amalekites seem to be the earliest people recognized in Scripture as inhabitants of Palestine, and to them I would say the term Ōgugēs clearly points, for as we shall shortly see, the Amalekites were called Agagi. There was also a historian named Asclepiades, who wrote on Egypt, and whose surname of Mendes (Suet. Aug. 94) would seem to point him out as a native of that country. He published a book on the Ogygian Egyptians (Suidas Ἡραΐσκος), and these Ogygians I take to be the Hykshos, who were certainly an Amalekitish people.

The Ōgugēs or Ōgugos of Greek legend in all probability represented the Scriptural name of Agag (Numb. 24. 7). Josephus (Ant. 11. 6. 5) styles Haman by descent an Amalekite, and in Esther (8. 3, and 3. 1) he is called an Agagite. Hence we may infer that the name of Agag, which is twice given (Numb. 24. 7, and 1 Sam. 15. 8) to the king of the Amalekites, meant simply *the* Amalekite. We are told that Saul (1 Sam. 15. 7) destroyed all the Amalekites from Havilah to Shur, but some of the eastern Amalekites must have escaped, for centuries afterwards there were Agagi in Persia[1].

[1] Lenormant, Lettres Assyriennes, p. 45.

Haman in all probability was one of the descendants of this Amalekitish remnant.

In Greek or Latin legend and mythus we find the terms Ogyges and Ogygia sometimes connected with the far west, sometimes with periods of remote antiquity. The author of the Odyssey (I. 50) makes Ōgugiē an island of the distant west, where dwelt Calypso, daughter of Atlas or of the Ocean, as the tale is told in the Theogony. Steph. Byz. informs us that Boeotia and Thebes were called Ōgugia from Ōgugēs son of Termera, who also gave the Lycians the name of Ōgugioi. The same writer quotes the Chronicles of Charax as his authority for saying that the whole of Attica was once called Ōgugia.

The migration westward, to which these allusions seem to point as the Ogygian, may have proceeded mainly from Palestine, or, to use language which is popular if not correct, may have been Philistine rather than Phoenician. It seems to have spread itself over the coast-districts of Asia Minor as well as over Greece, and to it probably belonged the various tribes known as the Lydian. The phrase 'the more ancient Hercules,' which is so often met with in legendary history, may be best explained by supposing it to refer to this early people.

Coupled with these Ogygian races we find mention made of a people called the Kadmeioi. They seem, however, to belong to a later date than the Ogygians, and, if I mistake not, to a different origin. The influences they brought to bear on Greek civilization cannot be questioned, and perhaps it may be thought that any attempt to trace their history might appear more appropriately in the next chapter, which deals specially with the history of early Greece, and with subjects therewith connected. But I believe that it was in consequence of Kadmean migration to Italy that the Trojan story first worked its way into Italian legend, and therefore I think the subject may be discussed with some advantage in the present chapter.

The word *kedem*, the east, seems to be used in Genesis

to denote districts lying east of Egypt or Palestine—e.g. a portion of southern Arabia (Gen. 10. 30), or the country round Haran (Gen. 29. 1), &c. But in the later Scriptures the phrase *Bene Kedem*, the Children of the East, seems to me more especially to indicate some of the tribes descended from Abraham and dwelling in the northern desert, such as the Midianites, Ishmaelites, &c. There is a strong probability that in this term *kedem* we have the original of Kadmos, that name so celebrated in Greek legend and mythus.

According to Apollodorus (3. 1. 1) Kadmos was brother to Phoinix and Kilix, and went to Thrace in search of Europa. From Thrace he went by order of an oracle to the site of Thebes, where, under the direction of Athena, he built a city. Afterwards he went to the Enkhelees in Illyricum and became their king. According to the Odyssey (11. 262) Amphion and Zethos founded Thebes. The two tales are not necessarily contradictory, for according to the mythologies Amphion and Zethos were descendants of Kadmos, and Kadmos is merely an eponym of the Kadmeioi, just as Phoinix and Kilix are eponyms respectively of the Phoinikes and the Kilikes. Homer styles the Thebans Kadmeioi (Il. 4. 391), and a portion of their country was called the Kadmean land down to a late period. The departure of Kadmos, i.e. of the Kadmeioi, to the Enkhelees, is said to have been owing to the conquest of Thebes by the Argives (Herod. 5. 61).

According to the mythologists, Kadmos went to Thrace; and we have the evidence of Herodotus (1.56) to show that Kadmeioi were once settled in that quarter, for he tells us the Dores were driven from Histiaeotis, i.e. from the district lying below Ossa and Olympus, by the Kadmeioi. This people were probably settled in Euboea before they went to Thrace, as Strabo tells us (10. 1. 8) that among the earliest inhabitants of the island were 'the Arabs that passed over with Kadmos.' We may, I think, conclude that the earliest European settlements of this people were in Euboea, and

that from this centre came both the Kadmeans of Thebes and the Paiones Agraioi and other Shemitic races whom we meet with in Thrace, and who, as we shall see reason to believe, must have belonged to the same or to some kindred race.

We have supposed Kadmos to be the eponym of the Kadmeioi, and to represent the Scriptural term Kedem. Let us endeavour to fix the locality of the people called in Scripture the Bene Kedem, or Children of the East, and see if we can discover any circumstances in their history which may account for their migration westward. Job, we are told, lived in the land of Uz, and was the greatest of all the Bene Kedem (1. 3). Uz, there can be little doubt, lay a little south of Damascus, and all the friends who visited Job appear to have been denizens of the line of country stretching from that city to the Elanitic gulf. Eliphaz came from Teman, a city noted for its 'wisdom,' and which, in the Egyptian tale translated by M. Chabas, is represented as the capital of 'Sakti[1].' Bildad the Shuhite must have been a descendant of Keturah (Gen. 25. 2), as was also Midian (Ib.) who was settled on the borders of the gulf. Elihu, 'son of Barachel the Buzite, of the kindred of Ram,' must have been an Arami living south of Damascus. The composition of the Book of Job has been fixed, on sound principles of criticism, a little before the time of Moses, and Moses called the country round Haran the land of the Bene Kedem (Gen. 29. 1). We know that shortly afterwards this neighbourhood was overrun with Hagarenes, and I think we may conclude that, even as early as the time of Moses, the Israelites looked upon the whole eastern border of the Northern Desert as mainly peopled by the descendants of the two concubines, Hagar and Keturah, and gave this people the name of Bene Kedem.

[1] See p. 176, above. The site of Teman has not yet been settled, but it was probably Selah (Petra). Sakti is the name given in the Egyptian inscriptions to the desert district lying north-east of Egypt. In the Ptolemaic period it seems to have been loosely used as a general name for Asia.

Now shortly after the conquest of Canaan, Chusan Rishathaim, king of Aram Naharaim, reduced the Israelites to servitude (Judg. 3. 8). Here then we have a wave of Aramaic conquest sweeping southwards, and quite sufficient to account for the displacement of certain tribes of the Bene Kedem. That there really was any such displacement is mere matter of inference, but the hypothesis deserves consideration, for it explains many facts we meet with in history. The two centuries that elapsed between the inroad of Chusan Rishathaim and the war of Troy, are sufficient to cover all the varied adventures which are ascribed to Kadmos and the Kadmeioi in Greek legend.

The most formidable enemies the Pharaohs of the eighteenth dynasty had to encounter in their Asiatic campaigns were the Assyrian race of the Rutennu. What were the relations that existed between this people and the Assyrians of Nineveh we cannot say. It was at a later period that the latter made themselves conspicuous in history. Can the Rutennu be the Assyrians of Resen (Gen. 10. 12)? Moses tells us that Resen was 'a great city,' and he evidently speaks of it as if it was flourishing in his own day, that is, at the very time the Rutennu were making head against some of the most powerful monarchs that ever reigned in Egypt. The letter-change between the dental and the sibilant need not occasion us any difficulty, for it was one of the commonest that is found in the Shemitic dialects. The decay of the Rutennu during the fourteenth century B.C. not only enabled Nineveh to enlarge its borders but also gave an opportunity for the Khita (Hittites) of the Orontes to make a figure in history. It was against this latter people that the Pharaohs of the nineteenth dynasty warred, and it was in a battle against Khita-sin, king of the Khita, that Ramses II made that exhibition of personal daring which Penta-ur has commemorated. Penta-ur's poem has been termed the Egyptian Iliad, and is found not only written in the 'Sallier papyrus,' but also sculptured on the walls of Thebes. We have thus not

only a contemporary record of a remarkable event, but by the aid of the accompanying pictures can follow out many of its details, and compare the Hittite chariots 'each containing three men' with the Egyptian chariots of the period. The terms of the treaty entered into by the two kings are known to us, and show us how great was the power the Hittites then possessed. The Pharaoh throughout treats the Hittite king as his equal, and their alliance was finally cemented by a marriage.

The name of Khita or Heth seems at one time to have been given to almost all the tribes that dwelt in Palestine and its neighbourhood, to the Hōrites of Mount Seir, the Amorites of Hebron, the Canaanites of the vale of Esdraelon, &c., but to have gradually fallen into disuse among the southern tribes after the Israelites gained a footing in the country. In the district of Lebanon, however, the name flourished for many centuries, and there, no doubt, lived the 'kings of the Hittites' (2 Kings 7. 6) who sent as far as Egypt to purchase chariots, which at that time were most in request and value (1 Kings 10. 29). These must have been the Hittites, whence came the Keteioi and Kitioi that flourish in Greek legend and mythus. In their war with the Egyptian Pharaohs in the fourteenth century B.C. this Hittite people seem to have been aided by many of the neighbouring races.

These confederacies form a marked feature in the history of this early period. The earliest trace of them that has fallen under my notice is to be found in the poem of Penta-ur, the Egyptian Iliad as it has been termed. This poem describes the campaign of Ramses II against the Khita or Hittites of the Orontes, and must have been written shortly after the event, or, in other words, about the year 1400 B.C. It mentions as allies of the Khita the Leka, the Masa, the Akesit, the Dardani, and the chiefs of Pedasa and Ilema. De Rougé recognized in these names the Luk-oi Mus-oi, Car-es, Dardanioi of classical literature, and in Pedasa and Ilema the Homeric Pedasus and Ilion. The

similarity between the two lists of names is certainly remarkable, and renders their identity probable. But I cannot agree with those scholars who consider such identity to prove the existence of a Trojan Empire at this date, which interfered to stop the conquests of the Egyptian Pharaoh.

The towns of Lycia, Tloos, Xanthos, Pinara, and Cragos, were no doubt piratical settlements, and two of these seem to have contributed to the population of the Troad. Lykas and Herakles are said to have driven the Bebryces from the Troad. Lykas the Lycian probably represented the subjects of Pandaros, i.e. the men of Pinara, and the Troes or men of the Lycian Tloos; Herakles may have represented the men that seized upon the plain of Thebē, in other words, the Kēteioi of the Odyssey, and the Kilikes of the Iliad. When the Briges returned to Europe and seized on the Troad, the Kilikes sailed to the southern coasts of Asia Minor, expelled the Arimoi, and founded Cilicia. The neighbouring plain of the Calycadnus took from them the name of Kētis.

The allies of the Khita were probably a body of buccaneers hired by the Khita to aid them against their formidable enemy. They were afterwards driven northwards by the officers of Minos—that grand shadow which may turn out to have more substance than the world has hitherto assigned to him.

The important position filled by certain Kadmeian families during the later periods of Greek history, and in some of the foremost states of Greece, is very remarkable. The Gephuraioi, who were certainly a Kadmeian people, came into Attica as fugitives, yet we find two of their number honoured as saviours of the state as late as the times of Herodotus (Herod. 5. 57). Some 300 years B.C. certain of the Lacedaemonians seemed to have looked upon the Jews as their kinsmen. In 1 Maccabees c. 12 a letter is mentioned said to have been sent 'in times past' to Onias, the high priest, by Areius, king of the Lacedae-

monians, which letter contained the following passage:—
'It is found in writing, that the Lacedaemonians and Jews are brethren, and that they are of the stock of Abraham, &c.' This letter is also quoted by Josephus (12. 4. 10) and, startling though the contents may be, I can see no reason to doubt its genuineness. No one can suppose that there was any blood-relationship between Abraham and the Dorians of Sparta; but the Spartan kings were of a different race from their subjects, and boasted themselves to be not Dorians but Akhaians (Herod. 5. 72). It may be that as Akhaioi they considered themselves to be connected with the Kadmeioi or Hagarenes, and therefore kinsmen of the Jews. The writings which gave the information they referred to was no doubt the Septuagint[1]. This Greek version of their scriptures the Jews carried with them into every country whither they wandered; and with hereditary astuteness they seem to have quoted it in favour of any policy they wished to further.

These Gephuraioi had their own temples with which the other Athenians had no concern, and especially one at Athens dedicated to Dēmētēr Akhaia (Herod. 5. 61); and when the annual procession went from Athens to Eleusis, this people were in the habit of pouring on those who took part in it abuse and ribaldry. From the bridge (Gephura) over the stream near Eleusis, where they stationed themselves for this purpose, it is said they obtained the name of Gephuraioi. This strange custom reminds us of the indecent mummeries, such as the election of the boy-bishop, &c., which were tolerated in the Middle Ages. It gave rise to phrases which were long current in the Greek language, but we have no information as to its origin.

The Gephuraioi declared that they came from Eretria in Euboea, but Herodotus (5. 57) believed them to be some of those Phoenicians who came with Kadmos when he established himself in the country afterwards called Boeotia, and that Tanagra, on the borders of Attica, was the portion

[1] Compare p. 228, above.

then assigned to them. According to Herodotus (5. 57) they were driven from Tanagra by the Boiōtai some time after the Kadmeans had been driven from Thebes by the Argives, and were admitted conditionally into the Athenian state. There is not any necessary inconsistency between the two accounts Herodotus has laid before us. He speaks (5. 62) of a Paioniē[1], which must have lain near Tanagra, whence came the Gephuraioi; and at Oropus, midway between Tanagra and Attica, Pausanias tells us (Att. 34. 3) there were altars dedicated to the Paionian Apollo and the Paionian Athēnē. As the Gephuraioi had their own temples, and therefore we may presume their own deities, it is a fair inference that we have here the Apollo and the Athene they worshipped. There was also an Attic district named Agra, which seems to have been in some way connected with this people and their temple of Dēmētēr[2].

When we find a tribe named Agriai or Agraioi[3] bordering upon the Paiones of Thrace, and closely connected with if not actually a portion of that people, we may reasonably conclude that men dwelling in the Attic district of Agra, and worshipping as it would seem a Paionian deity, were of the same stock, and that all these tribes whether living in Thrace or in Attica were by descent Kadmeans.

It is not only on the eastern side of Greece that we meet with Agraioi. A people bearing this name was also found in the west along the upper waters of the Achelous. Strabo alludes to them (10. 2. 5), but does not tell us what brought them into that neighbourhood. The later Macedonians refused to acknowledge them as Greeks (Pol. 17. 5), but

[1] Possibly this place may have given its name to Paionidai, an Attic district, the exact locality of which has not been settled. Pausanias (El. 1. 5) supposes Paionia to have been derived from Paion, son of Endumion, who had been driven from the Peloponnesus by the Dorians. But this mythus looks very like a tale invented to explain the name.

[2] 'Agra. The temple of Dēmētēr without the city, on the Ilissus.'—Suidas.

'Agrai. An Attic district without the city—the temple of Dēmētēr—certain soldiers were so called.'—Hesychius.

[3] Vide Steph. Byz. *s. v.* Agriai.

here again we are not told whether the refusal was justified by the fact of their being foreigners, or was merely an expression of dislike arising from their rude and uncivilized habits. As a portion of the Kadmeioi took refuge in Illyricum after the conquest of Thebes by the Argives, and as another portion was driven into Attica by the subsequent invasion of the Boiōtai[1], it is probable that the Agraioi on the Achelous were the descendants of other Kadmeian fugitives, who fled before the attacks of some of their many enemies. After a few centuries of exile, they may have sunk to a level of the barbarous tribes around them.

We may trace the Agraioi still further westward. The Theogony enumerates the heroes who were descended from a goddess and a mortal father, and as sons of Circe and Odusseus it names Latinos, Telegonos, and Agrios, and represents them as reigning over all the Tursēnoi (Theog. 1016). As the island of Circe is generally identified with the Mons Circeius on the coast of Latium, and as Odusseus came from western Greece, the mythus seems to intimate that tribes symbolized respectively by Latinos, Telegonos, and Agrios migrated from western Greece into Latium, and there exercised a kind of supremacy over the Tyrrhenian population. I do not stop to discuss the origin of the Theogony, whether it be the work of Hesiod, or, according to modern criticism, a production of the Hesiodic school, which flourished among the Locri Ozolae. In either case we have here the earliest mention of the name Latinos which is to be found in literature. The country lying south of the Tiber and drained by the Liris may be taken as representing roughly the ancient Latium. We will inquire who were the Tursēnoi who appear in the Theogony as forming the subject race of the district.

The most ancient mention of the Tursēnoi, after that in the Theogony, occurs in a fragment of Sophocles, preserved by Dionysius (1. 25). The name is there assigned to the earliest inhabitants of Argos.—

[1] See pp. 244, 250.

'Inakhos Sire! Child of the waters—
Of Father Ocean—who dost hold high place
Over the fields of Argos, and the hills of Hera [1],
And over the Turrhēnoi Pelasgoi—

According to Thucydides (4. 109) the peninsula of Mount Athos was principally occupied by Pelasgoi, a portion of those Tursēnoi who once dwelt at Athens, Lemnos, Bisaltia, Crestonia, and the country of the Edones. Lastly, Herodotus tells us (1. 94) that a body of Ludoi, under the conduct of Tursēnos, sailed from Smyrna, and after traversing many countries landed among the Ombrikoi, where they still remained and were called the Tursēnoi.

Of all the etymologies that have been proposed to explain the term Pelasgoi, that which derives it from *palaios*, old, is the most plausible. On this hypothesis Pelasgoi would mean the Old People—the ancient tribes. As new political combinations arose, the old tribes were in most cases driven from the western valleys to the hills and forests which abound in eastern Greece; and in later ages we find the Pelasgoi generally represented as uncivilized races living in these wild regions on the natural produce of the earth. But there were some of these old tribes whose civilization could not be gainsaid, and who had raised structures which long commanded (Paus. 2. 165) and indeed still command the admiration of the traveller. It was to a body of Pelasgoi that the Athenians intrusted the building of the walls which surrounded their acropolis (Herod. 6. 137). The contrast between these great builders and the rude Pelasgoi of the forest districts seem to have procured for the former the name of Pelasgoi Tursēnoi, or, simply, the Tursēnoi or tower-builders—*tursis* answering to the Latin *turris*, a tower. Some of the authors referred to by Dionysius (1. 26) adopted this etymology, and it seems to have been generally accepted by Greek antiquaries (vide Tzetzes in Lyc. 717). The notion however that the Tursēnoi received this name in Italy

[1] The great temple of Hērē at Argos was built on the slope of the hill on which stood the acropolis.

because they were the first that built fortified cities in that country is more questionable, though Dionysius (I. 28) quotes Hellanicus of Lesbos as favouring the opinion. The name of Tursēnoi was an ancient one in Greece. In the Homeric hymn to Dionusos the pirates that seized the youthful god were Tursēnoi, and the scene is evidently laid not in Italian but in Grecian waters. Athenaeus also (15. 12) cites Menodotus of Samos as his authority for saying that 'Turrhēnoi' were engaged to recover from Samos the statue of Hera, which the daughter of Eurystheus had carried off from Argos; and elsewhere (7. 47) he tells us, on the authority of Possis the Magnesian, that Jason the Argonaut fought with the Turrhēnoi. Unless we altogether ignore these passages we cannot consider the Tyrrheni as originating in Italy. The fame of the Italian Tyrrheni was probably the cause why the race that bore the name in Greece fell into obscurity.

The little we know of the early history of the Italian Tursēnoi is to be gathered from Dionysius. He tells us (I. 19) that certain Pelasgoi who had come from Dodona passed over into Italy by order of the oracle; and this oracle Lucius Mamius, a man of repute, declared he had seen written in archaic letters on a tripod dedicated to the god in the temple of Zeus:

> 'Go seek the Saturnian land of the Sikeloi
> And Cotulē of the Aborigines, where the island swims;
> With them join yourselves, and send tithes to Phoebus
> And heads to the son of Kronos and a man to the Father.'

The Pelasgoi accordingly sailed to the mouth of the Po, and after various adventures found themselves in the land of the Aborigines, near the sacred lake and its marvellous island. The two races became allies, and together won many towns from the Ombrikoi and the Sikeloi. But the Pelasgoi, after reaching a high state of prosperity (I. 23), gradually declined, and on enquiry were told by the oracle that they had not, according to promise, offered to the gods tithes of their most precious things, that is of their children,

and had therefore brought on themselves these miseries. We are told that Myrsilus of Lesbos gave the same account of the matter, but called the people Turrhēnoi instead of Pelasgoi. These Turrhēnoi, as Myrsilus called them, began to decline one or two generations before the Trojan War, but were for some time afterwards an important tribe (Dion. I. 26).

The reader will probably give little credit to the report of Lucius Mamius, but the supposed inscription is worth quoting, as it shows how deeply the story of the Tursēnoi Pelasgoi had sunk into *Italian* legend, for it was only in Italy that Dionysius could have met with the particular version of the 'oracle' which he has handed down to us. Its testimony to the decline of the Italian Tursēnoi is not only consistent with the mythus in the Theogony, but also throws light on the Italian legends on which Virgil founded his tale of the Aeneid.

The Turrhenoi of whom we have been speaking must have been one of the most ancient tribes of Italy. The earliest notice of them, that in the Theogony, represents them as a decayed and subject race. Yet in the fifth century B.C. there was a people called Tursēnoi, who according to Herodotus dominated in the seas lying west of Italy, and who, according to Dionysius (7. 3), led a vast army of barbarians against Cumae about the year 525 B.C. These Tursēnoi were certainly the Etrusci of Roman history, and the native name of this people was Rasenna (Dion. I. 30). Niebuhr accordingly maintained that the Etrusci were a mixed people, made up of Pelasgic Tyrrheni and a dominant race called the Rasenna—the whole taking the name of the subject-people, just as the English are sometimes called Britons. It was to this people—that is, to the Tursēnoi known to his contemporaries—that Herodotus referred, when he spoke of them as a body of Ludoi, who sailed from Smyrna under the conduct of Tursēnos. He must have been referring to the dominant race, the Rasenna, but unfortunately gave them the name which they had

acquired from the subject-race in Italy. His want of care in selecting his terms has caused no little bewilderment to historians, both in ancient and in modern times.

It was a speculation of Niebuhr's, and one that commends itself to our judgment more than some other of his speculations, that the Turnus of Virgil's story represented the Tyrrhenian people. It is true that Virgil gives the Etruscans the name of Tyrrheni, according to the later Roman fashion, but this is what we might expect. Virgil was poet and antiquary, but certainly neither historian nor critic; and he concocted his story out of the materials within his reach, whether furnished by legend or by his personal knowledge and experience. Stripped of later appliances, the story he followed seems to have represented Latins and Tyrrhenians—or, as Dionysius would have termed them, the Aborigines and Pelasgoi—as tribes banded together to resist a foreign invader who had secured the support of certain Arcadians that shortly before had settled on the Tiber. The Latins after a time made terms with the invader, and the Tyrrhenians sank beneath his attacks. Such is probably a rough outline of the Italian legends on which Virgil constructed the Aeneid.

We will now inquire into the origin of the races who in the Hesiodic mythus are represented as dominating over the Tursēnoi, and are personified respectively by its Agrios and Tēlegonos. According to Stephanus Byzantinus the Agriai were a people of Paeonia living between Mounts Haemus and Rhodopē, and he tells us they were also called the *Agraioi*. Now the Paeones boasted of being descendants of the Teukroi and Musoi, whose invasion of Europe, a few generations before the Trojan War, was followed by such important consequences. If Agraios personified these Agraioi, we have a Teucrian people represented, in the earliest mythus we know of relating to central Italy, as one of the ruling races in that district; and we see at once the origin of the legend on which Virgil built the story of Aeneas and his Trojans. The only people of antiquity whose name

answers to that of Telegonos were the Telkhines. The Telkhines were the earliest inhabitants of Sicyon, which is said to have been the most ancient city of Greece, and lay over against the Locri Ozolae, amongst whom a school of Hesiodic poetry is said to have flourished. The Latin *g* not unfrequently represented the Greek *kh*—e. g. *khalbanā* galbanum, *agkhō* ango, *okhlos* vulgus, &c.—so there is no philological objection to our identification of the word Telegonos with Telkhines.

Now Telegonos is said to have founded Tusculum a few miles south of Rome, and Virgil's Evander is said to have fixed his abode on the Palatine Hill; hence we find Telegonos and Evander brought into close local connection with each other in the Italian legend. Again Evander, according to the mythologists, was a son of Hermes and an Arcadian nymph, and therefore must have been a near neighbour of the Peloponnesian Telkhines. Hence I think we may venture to infer a legendary connection between the Latin Telegonos and the Greek Telkhines. If so, we have a second point of agreement between the Hesiodic mythus and the celebrated story which the genius of Virgil has immortalized. Of course if these speculations be trustworthy, the early Greeks must have had a more intimate acquaintance with central Italy than we usually give them credit for. They must have known the political relations which existed between the different races living there, and also the form which the Greek name Telkhines assumed in their language. But this is what might be expected. The thoroughly Italian name of Latinos was certainly known to the Greeks when the Theogony was written, and so widely were the Latins recognized as a kindred race a century or two later, that one writer, referring to the destruction of Rome by the Gauls, speaks of it as a Greek city destroyed by the barbarians. Rome and Latium seem indeed to have kept up a familiar intercourse with the Mediterranean districts from a very early period; for an eclipse of the sun, which was visible at Cadiz in the year

399 B.C., was known, as it would seem, at Rome, and entered in their public records.

The mythus of Hesiod and the legends of Virgil evidently refer to a period later than that Dionysius had in view when he spoke of the expulsion of the Siculi. The Siculi had disappeared from Latium, and the Aborigines who had expelled them had no doubt taken their place, for I think there can be little doubt of the identity of his Aborigines and the people whom Hesiod referred to under the name Latinos. As to Telegonos, we have ventured to suggest that he represented the Telkhines of Sicyon. If Telegonos symbolized the primitive inhabitants of Sicyon, and Agraios the Teucrian Agraioi, the legends on which Virgil based his great Epic become intelligible, and to a certain extent historical. The least ray of light on a subject so obscure, and at the same time so interesting, is welcome.

CHAPTER IX.

The sons of Javan, Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim. — Javan, the primitive name of the Greek people, answers to the Greek Iōn (whence Iōnes) the old Persian Yuna and the Sanscrit Yavan-ah. — Chittim or Kittim, the *popular* name for the Greeks among the Jews; originally applied to the Cares of Cyprus; the language of the Cypriote Cares a Greek dialect; their alphabet resembled the Lycian; may have been in general use among the Greeks before the adoption of the Kadmean letters; the Cares distinctively a military people; origin of the name; the Cares of the Aegean referred to by Herodotus as Leleges; the Leleges, any body of Greeks levied for military service; origin of the name. — Dodanim properly meant the men of Dodona; Dodona originally a name for the hill-country lying north and west of Thessaly; gave its name to the ancient temple situated within it. — The tribes driven from the plain took refuge in the Highlands and were called Pelasgoi and Graikoi, i.e. the old tribes; the term Graikoi adopted by the Latins as a general name for the Greek race; Pelasgoi found in various parts of Greece. — The lakes around the temple of Dodona called Hellē, the people Helloi or Hellēnes and the country Hellas; the name of Hellas prevailed in consequence of the Dorian conquests, and in the classical period became the recognized name for Greece. — Elishah a personification of Eleusis, where was the great temple of Dēmētēr, or Akhaia. — The worship of this goddess spread as part of the Kadmean culture; and worked its way among the Danaoi of the Peloponnesus, but was stoutly resisted by the Athēnaioi or worshippers of Athēnē; the Akhaioi became predominant in Greece and continued so till the Peloponnesus was overrun by the Hellenic Dorians. — Homer uses the name Akhaioi for the Greeks in general, but seems to have recognized the Hellēnes as a co-ordinate branch of the Greek people. — The Lokroi retained to a late period the light armour of the eastern nations, and were thereby distinguished in Homer's day from the Akhaioi and the Hellēnes; the heavy-armed Greek made his first appearance about the year 1000 B.C. — The name of Tarshish answers to the Tartessus of classical geography; Greeks settled there in the time of Moses; legendary notices of Greek intercourse with this remote district; Egyptian story of the Atlantis and of the wars which the early Greeks waged with the inhabitants. — Story of 'the more ancient Hercules'; his expedition to the West; disruption of the confederacy in Spain about the year 1500 B.C.; the allies retire to Northern Africa, the Persae according to Sallust settling on the coast between the Ocean and the Syrtes, and the 'Medi' and 'Armenii' on the coast between the Syrtes and Egypt. — Conquest of the 'Atlantic State' by the Amazones, as related by the elder Dionysius; these Amazones the

same people as the Mashawasha of the hieroglyphic inscriptions, the Maxues of Herodotus and the Persae of Sallust; the name of Persae long kept its ground in the geography of Africa; and the name Amazones still lives in the Berber name Amazigh. — The mythus of Perseus and Andromeda symbolized the Persian conquest; the name Kephēnes given by the Greeks to the Persians may have been derived from Kufa a name found in the hieroglyphic inscriptions, and probably signifying a race of the conquered Berbers; may be the same name as the Scriptural Chub (Ezek. 30. 5). — Alien races settled not only in the east but also in the west of the Delta, a white race settled on the site of the future Alexandria. — Invasion of Egypt by 'the peoples of the sea'—Turisha, Akhaiosha, Sikelosha, Kehak, Rebu, &c.; the invaders the same races as the Dorieis, Akhaioi, Sikeloi, &c. of Greek history. — Dorieis and Akhaioi in Crete; colonization of that island; Cherethim or Cretans introduced into Palestine; acted as a body-guard to David as also to several of the Egyptian Pharaohs. — The helmets of the Cherethim indicate their worship of Orotal and Alilat, the favourite gods of their neighbours; the worshippers of Dionusos distinguished by the Sisoē; the Tamahu living west of the Nile tattooed the symbol of the goddess Neith on their persons. — The Philistines wore the head-dress of the goddess Anaka, as Egyptian pictures represent the Anakim. — The goddess Onka had a temple in ancient Thebes, and gave a name to the Onkian gate.

The settlements of the Danaoi in Greece probably owing to the immigration of tribes driven from Tahennu by the Egyptians; the Perseids later immigrants. — These foreigners adopted the Akhaian propagandism and thus became distinguished from the Athenaioi, and at a later period from the Dorians. — The Persians and the connected races long continued to play the part of military adventurers; were employed as mercenaries in Egypt, at Tyre and in Colchis; from the latter place probably penetrated into the districts which afterwards bore their names. — Their allies the Kehak seem to have followed in their footsteps and to have established the nation of the 'Haic' or Armenians.

In the present chapter we have to deal not with obscure tribes whose names sound strangely in our ears, but with a people whose history has been familiar to us from boyhood, and exercised over us a fascination that may perhaps mislead our judgment. It is not however on the full tide of Greek history we have to sail; we have to explore the remoter sources, where the stream is still struggling in the defile, and at every leap forwards breaking on the rocks. I believe in this, as in other similar cases, our best mode of meeting the difficulties before us will be by recurring to the oldest extant record, and in the present, as on so many former occasions, we must look for it in the tenth chapter

of Genesis, the Toldoth Bene Noah, as our speculators love to call it. The notices it contains point to conclusions which, startling though they be, seem to furnish us with the means of reconciling many apparent discrepancies, and of explaining much that has hitherto perplexed us, when attempting to unravel the intricacies of early Greek history.

'And the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim'—such are the terms in which Moses describes one of the great Japhetic families (Gen. 10. 4), and his description no doubt embodied opinions which educated Egyptians at that time held with respect to the main divisions of the Greek people. Elishah and Tarshish seem to be names of places, used to denote races, which regarded them as the centres of their respective nationalities. Kittim and Dodan-im take the Shemitic plural ending, and there can be little doubt originally signified the men of Kit and the men of Dodan. Where were situate the several localities, Kit and Dodan, Elishah and Tarshish, are the questions we have to investigate.

In writing the word Javan I follow the orthography of our Authorized Version. I believe it would be possible to represent a Hebrew word in English letters so as to enable a scholar to reclothe it in its native orthography, and assign to it its proper Hebrew character, though I have never met with a system which professed to give the means of doing so, and was not a failure. But to dress up terms which have been familiar to us from childhood in a new-fangled orthography is more likely to bewilder than to instruct the reader; and, though we might thus get a more correct philology, it would be at the expense of associations which should not be lightly trifled with. I follow therefore the old orthography, barbarous though it be, and though it may in some cases lead to inconsistencies that require explanation. The word Javan, or some word answering to it, was widely spread throughout the East, as the proper name of the Greek people. It was the Yuna

of the Behistun inscriptions, the Yavan-ah[1] of the Sanscrit, and according to the best informed Egyptologists the Uinim of the ancient Egyptian. Whether it was ever used among the Jews as a general name for the Greeks may be doubted; but when the shade of coming evils was gathering over Israel, we find the Hebrew prophets[2] making mention of a people bearing this name. They were slave-dealers frequenting the markets of Tyre; and as they are coupled with Tubal and Meshech, probably came from the Greek colonies on the Euxine. The name of Javan must have been familiarly known to the inhabitants of Tyre, and the Jews may have borrowed it from the Tyrians specially to designate the traders with whom they were then unhappily brought into contact. When shortly afterwards the Jews were carried away to Babylon, we have Daniel (8. 21) and Zechariah (9. 13) following the usage of the people among whom they were dispersed, and giving to Javan a more general signification, and our translators boldly render it by the words Greece and Graecia. I-ōn-es, the Graecized form of Javan, was used by the Greeks to designate merely portions of their race, though generally such as were distinguished for their antiquity and Pelasgic origin, as the Athenians (Herod. 1. 56) and the Ionians expelled from the Peloponnesus by the Akhaioi (Herod. 7. 94). Aeschylus indeed uses the term Iaones as a *general* name for his countrymen, but he always, I believe, puts the word into the mouth of foreigners (vide Suppl. 69; Persae 176, 561, &c.).

The term Chittim or Kittim was no doubt the name *popularly* used by the Jews to designate the Greek people. Balaam brings the ships that were to afflict Asshur and Eber from 'the coasts of Chittim' (Numb. 24. 24); and the author of the first Book of Maccabees (1. 1.)—probably

[1] I put Sanscrit words in their nominatival form, to show more clearly their relation to the corresponding words of the kindred languages, and more particularly of the Greek and Latin.

[2] Isai. 66. 19, Ezek. 27. 13, and Joel 3. 6 (translated Grecians).

with reference to this prophecy—represents Alexander the son of Philip as coming from the land of Chettiim. The isles of the Chittim (Ezek. 27. 6), whence the Tyrians obtained their *shem* or ivory, were in all probability the shores of North Africa west of Egypt—in other words the Cyrenaica which the Corinthians had begun to colonize some forty or fifty years before Ezekiel prophesied. It is maintained by Shemitic scholars, that the word which our translators render *isles*, might be more correctly rendered 'maritime districts.' The Chittim are commonly represented as a maritime people; in Ezek. 27. 6 we find the word Chittim coupled with the word *isles*; in two other places (Numb. 24. 24 and Dan. 11. 30), with the word *ships*, and again in two other passages (Isa. 23. 1 and 23. 12), the name is introduced with immediate reference to the great maritime city of antiquity, Tyre. The Jews who wrote the Septuagint are inconsistent in their rendering of the term. Sometimes they leave it untranslated (Jer. ii. 10); once they render it '*the* Khetteeim' (Ezek. 27. 6), and in Numb. 24. 24, and in Isa. 23. 1, they translate Chittim by Kitiaioi, and in Dan. 11. 30 by Kitioi. Let us see if we can gain any knowledge of the origin of the name.

Josephus tells us (Ant. 1. 6. 1) that Khethimos took possession of the island Khethima. 'It is now called Kupros (Cyprus), and from it all islands and most districts by the sea are called Kethim by the Hebrews; and as a proof of my statement there is a city in Kupros which has managed to retain the name, for it is still called Kitios by those who have Graecized it, thus hardly changing the name of Khethimos.' Whatever we may think of the 'proof' Josephus tenders, his assertion as to the Hebrew usage of the word Chittim is, as we have seen, well founded. Some two hundred years ago our countryman Pocock visited the site of Citium in Cyprus, and discovered there many Phoenician inscriptions showing beyond a doubt that it was a Phoenician town. Most of the inscriptions were

imperfect, and as the vowels have generally to be supplied, some uncertainty must attend any attempt at translation. But they have engaged the attention of competent scholars, and, as they are mostly[1] epitaphs, the meaning is generally obvious enough. One of these inscriptions particularly deserves notice, as it tends to throw light on the subject before us:—

'On the .... day of the month Marpa in the .... year
Of king Nam .... Yitten king of Kyt Karim (*mlk kyt karm*)
King of the Yanan (*mlk ynn*) king of the Kiti Karim (*mlk k*(*t*)*i karm*) died
Tzayamatz son of Yonamam the Hamathite,' &c.

Mövers supposed Yanan in this inscription to signify the Ionians (Iones). I would rather look on it as the primitive name for the Greek race answering to the Uinim of the Rosetta stone, and to the Javanim of the prophet Joel (3. 6).[2] Among the more ancient tribal names which appear in Grecian history are the names of the Cares and Leleges. Herodotus tells us (1. 171) that the Cares of the Aegean were Leleges, though in other cases we see the Cares and Leleges distinguished from each other. In history we not unfrequently find some branch of a common stock keeping itself aloof from the kindred tribes. Yanan may have been a general name for the Hellenic colonists, who came into Cyprus from Salamis, Athens, Arcadia, Cythnus (Herod. 7. 90), and Karim, the name of the old native race, which, though Greek in origin, had adopted a peculiar organization, and become more distinctly a military people. The language and civilization of Hellenic Greece was not generally prevalent in Cyprus till the reign of Evagoras, king of Salamis, at the close of the fourth century B.C.

Kit is probably the Phoenician equivalent for the scriptural Heth; and if we adopt the generally received opinion that this name is represented by the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments it must have been a name by which the Phoenicians in ancient times were widely known. The Kilikes

[1] Mövers, Phönizische Alterthum 2 band 2, p. 212.
[2] Our Authorized Version renders Javanim by the word 'Grecians.'

were of the same race as the Phoenicians, and the plain of the Calycadnus, one of the richest districts of Cilicia, was called Kētis, evidently from the name of the people who had settled there. The Kilikes of the Iliad who lived in the Troad appear in the Odyssey (11. 521) as the Kēteioi; and the name may be traced in other localities where we have reason to believe there was a Phoenician population. We have already seen[1] that the Jews who translated the Septuagint rendered the term Chittim sometimes by Kitiaioi, and sometimes by Kitioi.

We may, I think, gather from the inscription I have quoted that Cyprus was called by the Phoenicians Kit-Karim, i.e. Kit of the Carians, and that it contained two races alien to the Phoenicians, namely, the Yanan and the Kiti-Karim, i.e. Kitian Carians, over both of which the Phoenician Melek claimed suzerainty. It is true, as Gesenius has more than once told us, that the letter-change between the initials *k* and *h* is not a common one; but there are examples of it, and in his explanation[2] of one of the Phoenician inscriptions found in Cyprus he is obliged to consider the two names *Kit* and Heth as merely varied forms of the same word. Hittim, which our translators generally render by the word Hittites, seems at first to have been used by the Jews as a general name for the Canaanites, as in the phrases 'the land of the Hittim' (Jos. i. 4), 'the kings of the Hittim' (2 Kings 7. 6), etc.

The Phoenicians may have given to Cyprus the name of Kit when they took possession of it, but in order to distinguish it from their native seats on the mainland they called it Kit-Karim, i.e. Kit of the Carians—the Carians being the most important of the subject-races. Moses, on the one hand, who probably knew the Phoenician country on the mainland by the name of Heth, had no need to make such distinction, and simply gave the island its Phoenician name of Kit—Kittim in his vocabulary signifying

[1] Vide p. 262.

[2] Vide Monumenta, Inscriptiones Citienses, 40, p. 152.

the people of Kit, Phoenician or Greek according to the exigency of the context. Under nearly similar circumstances he gave the name of Ludim to the Egyptians settled in the Shemitic district of Lud.[1]

Some twenty or thirty years ago the Duc de Luynes, with such means as were then at his disposal, endeavoured to compile a Cypriote alphabet. As was to be expected, he was in many points mistaken, and the discovery of other inscriptions, one of them a bilingual inscription in Cypriote and Phoenician, has enabled philologists to correct his errors. The Cypriote monuments last discovered were brought to this country a few years back and submitted to the scrutiny of English scholars. It appears that the Cypriote word answering to the Phoenician word *melek* is the Greek *basileus*; and the general character of the language has a close resemblance to that of the Greek (Bibl. Archaeol. I. 133).[2] The Cypriote letters have little or no affinity with the Phoenician, but the strongest affinity with the Lycian; indeed thirteen of them are identical with characters found on the Lycian monuments discovered by Sir Charles Fellows. As the Cypriote inscriptions are probably the work of the Cypriote Karim, and as the Lycians bordered closely on the Carians proper, the strong resemblance between the two alphabets was what might have been expected.

The many points of resemblance between the two alphabets, Lycian and Cypriote, suggests matter of interesting speculation. We have seen reasons to believe that the Trōes of Homer were connected with the Lycians (p. 241), and Pandaros, chief the Trōes, dwelling on the Aisēpos, is called the son of Lukaōn. Now Lukaōn, son of Pelasgos, was the mythical patriarch whence descended the Oinōtroi and the earliest Greek colonies that peopled Italy. It

[1] Vide p. 179.

[2] Vide paper in Rev. Archéologique (1872), xxiii, in which mention is made of G. Smith's translation 260. Halévy considered the Cypriote characters to have been derived from the Cuneiform letters of Assyria.

seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that Carians, Lycians, Trojans, &c., were Greek races, bearing to the Hellenic or classical Greeks the same relation that the Greek races in southern and central Italy bore to them, and it would appear that these Greek races in Asia had an alphabet distinct from the Phoenician alphabet which the Hellenic Greeks adopted. When, and under what circumstances, did these latter reject what we may suppose to have been their native alphabet, and adopt that of the foreigner? Is there any connexion between these early Greek alphabets and the various alphabets current in Italy? It has been maintained that the Phoenician characters were derived from the hieroglyphics of Egypt, whence came the alphabets that were in use in Cyprus and Lycia; and what was the origin and the nature of the civilization they indicate? It would seem that the old dispute about the Kadmean and the Pelasgic letters must be re-opened, and new matter taken into consideration, before the dispute can be brought to a satisfactory settlement.

The doubts which have been expressed as to the Greek origin of the Carians appear to me unreasonable, though it must be confessed that little success has hitherto attended the efforts made to trace analogies between the Carian dialects and the Greek. Homer (Il. 2. 867) styles the Cares 'men of barbarous utterances[1].' He never alludes to the foreign speech of the other races he speaks of, Phruges, Kilikes, &c., though they spoke languages which must have been quite unintelligible to him, and I can only account for his noticing the speech of the Carians on the supposition that it was a barbarous dialect of his own native tongue. Strabo (14. 2. 28) will not have the Carian

[1] Barbaro-phōnoi. I do not render this phrase 'men of barbarous speech,' for I have doubts whether *phōnē* signified a language, as early as the time of Homer, but my argument would be only slightly affected, by giving it this meaning. I believe barbaro-phōnoi to be equivalent to *agriophōnoi*, which is applied in the Odyssey (8 294) to the Sinties, who inhabited Lemnos. The Sinties were probably Pelasgi in origin.

to be a particularly broad kind of speech, for it had a great many Greek words interspersed in it, as says 'Philippos, who wrote on the affairs of Caria'; but, he continues, 'I think that barbarism (*to barbaron*) was, by coining a term, first attributed to those who spoke with difficulty, or badly, or broadly, e.g. *battarizein*, *traulizein*, *psellizein* (stammering, lisping, faltering), for we are singularly apt in expressing sounds by like sounds on account of their kindred character, and now the coining of terms has been carried to excess, e.g. *kelaruzein*, *klaggē*, *psophos*, *boē*, *krotos* (murmuring, clang, sound, cry, rattling), of which terms the most are now used in speech and authorized. All who spoke thus broadly were called barbaroi, and the speech of other races appeared to be of the same kind—I mean of those who were not Greeks. These, then, they properly called *barbaroi*, at first by way of reproach, as men of thick or harsh utterance, then we misapplied the phrase, and by means of it, separated them thereby as by a common national name, from the Greeks. For by much intercourse and intimacy with the Barbarians no longer did this seem to happen with relation to thickness of pronunciation, and a certain inability of the vocal organs, but according to the peculiarities of the dialects. And in our tongue there appeared a certain bad, and as it were barbarous, mode of speech, when any one in talking Greek did not observe propriety of speech, but uttered words as the Barbarians do when first made acquainted with Greek, and not able to speak correctly—as we likewise do in their dialects. But this happened in an especial manner with the Carians, for while the others had no great intercourse with the Greeks, nor attempted to live in Grecian fashion, or to learn our dialect, unless in rare cases and by chance a few were mixed up individually with certain of the Greeks—*these* wandered over the whole of Greece serving for hire.'

It would seem therefore that in Strabo's opinion the speech of the Carians was nothing more than a coarse

variety of the refined and beautiful language he spoke himself. Judging from the Cypriote, which we may perhaps assume to be a Carian dialect, it would seem that one peculiarity of the Carian dialects was a tendency to melt the enclytics, the articles, &c., into the word they were connected with. This tendency is often met with in language, and during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a marked characteristic of our own. Such phrases as *thone, thother*, *therle*, &c., *a nawl*, *a nadder*, *a nother*, &c., abound in English works then written or printed.

The Cares, as we have said, devoted themselves in an especial manner to a military life. Century after century we find them acting as a race of mercenaries, fighting for any people that was able and willing to pay for their services. Herodotus (1. 171) attributes to them three inventions; crests for helmets, devices for shields, and the *okhana*, which appear to have been straps attached to the shield, by which it could be more conveniently handled than when merely suspended from the neck and shoulder by a belt. The first and second of these inventions had been widely adopted by the Greeks in the time of Homer, and therefore we must assign to their invention a remote antiquity. The horse-hair streaming from the helmet suggests a plausible etymology for the name Kares. *Kara* and *Karē* mean the top of anything, and the old word *kar* is said to mean the hair of the head. The Kares may possibly have derived their name from their head-gear. The *a* is long in Kāres and short in Kăra, but in the derivation of these old-world phrases such difference of quantity is by no means a formidable objection.

The Kares worshipped Zeus of the Camp (*Zeus stratios*), and according to Herodotus (5. 119) were the only people who worshipped that god[1]. They multiplied their settle-

[1] This statement must be accepted with reserve. The Carian Zeus at Mylassa was worshipped by the Ludoi and Musoi as being 'brethren' of the Cares (Herod. 1. 171). The word brethren, as here used, must signify allies,

ments probably under Phoenician guidance, and one portion of them had the name Leleges given to them. According to Cretan report (Herod. I. 171) the Kares were Leleges who were settled in the islands of the Aegean, and manned the fleet of the Cretan king Minos, but at a later period were driven into Asia Minor by the Dores and Iones. According to Thucydides, Phoenician and Carian pirates once occupied the islands (I. 8), but Minos collected a fleet, and driving the Kares from the Cyclades, established his own kinsmen there to keep the peace of the seas (I. 4). It is probable that Herodotus or his informants represented the Dores and Iones as the people who expelled the Carians from the islands, because at a later period they drove them from many of their towns on the mainland. But the Carians were settled on the Continent before the time of Homer, and therefore can hardly have been driven thither by the Dores and Iones. If we suppose that Minos expelled from the islands only those Carians who refused to submit to his authority, and employed the others as seamen on board his fleet, we may perhaps reconcile accounts which at first sight appear discrepant.

Themistocles, when opposing the Persians, built much on the hope of detaching the Ionians and Carians from the enemy (Herod. 8. 10). As he retreated he left inscriptions behind him praying the Ionians either to join their kinsmen or to remain neuter, and to persuade the Carians to do so likewise (Herod. 8. 22). He did not press the claims of kinship upon the Kares, it may be because he did not understand their dialect, but he couples them with the Ionians, and seems to have looked on both races as being more or less connected with the Greek people.

i.e. brethren in arms, for we are told that other races were not allowed to join in the worship, even though they spoke the Carian language. The worship of the god must have spread gradually over the whole of Asia Minor, for when Murena was driven out of Pontus, Mithridates ordered a grand sacrifice to be made to Zeus Stratios, according to what was in his time an '*ancient* custom' (Appian Bell. Mithr. 66).

Strabo (7. 7. 2), after tracing the Leleges in various localities, falls back upon the authority of Hesiod :

> 'For Lokros truly led the people of the Leleges,
> Whom once Zeus son of Kronos, of eternal councils mindful,
> Gave to Deucalion—a people gathered (*lektous*) from the ground.'

Strabo then proceeds, 'it seems to me to be suggested by the etymology that they were a people brought together (*sullektous*) and mixed with others from ancient times.' It seems clear that both Hesiod and Strabo connected the name of Leleges with the verb *legō*, to gather. On this hypothesis Le-leg-es must be a duplicate noun. I cannot, however, accept the meaning given to the term by either of these ancient authorities. If Leleges be a duplicate noun founded on *legō*, the only appropriate meaning I can assign to it is that of the gatherings or levies. The related word *lokh-os* means an armed band, a body of troops, and more than one derivation of *legō* signifies to raise or levy soldiers. Leleges may have been the name given to such of the early Greeks as lent themselves out for military service, chiefly under the guidance of foreigners—and it may have conveyed to the mind of their countrymen nearly the same idea as the word Sepoy to the modern Hindoo. The real etymology of the word must have been lost, or at least obscurely known in the days of Hesiod, or he would hardly have written the lines preserved by Strabo.

Dodanim (Gen. 10. 4) there can be little doubt meant the people of Dodan. The Dodona of Epirus plays no inconsiderable part in the early history of Greece. Its temple, according to Ephorus (Str. 7. 7. 10, p. 328) was founded by the Pelasgoi, and 'the Pelasgoi of all who held rule in Greece are said to be the most ancient.' Its oracle took rank beside those of Delphi and Jupiter Ammon. Achilles (Il. 16. 233) calls its priests the Selloi :

> 'Zeus king! the Dodonean, the Pelasgic, dwelling afar
> Lord of Dodona the wintry—around the Selloi

> Dwelt thine interpreters, with unwashed[1] feet, the ground their bed.
> Of a truth thou didst hear my words as I prayed,' &c.

Pindar (Str. 7. 7. 10) used the term Helloi instead of Selloi, in accordance with a well-known letter change, and Hesiod (Ib.) calls the district Hellopia.

> 'There is a Hellopiē with cornfields and goodly meadows
> Where on the furthest border is built a Dodōnē.'

According to Hesychius, Ela or Hella was the name of the temple, and Elloi or Hellēnes the name of the people who dwelt there. According to Apollodorus (Str. 7. 7. 10, p. 328) the name of the temple was derived from the lakes in its neighbourhood, and as modern scholars have fixed the site of Dodona near the lake of Janina, this etymology is probably the correct one. When the Dorians, who came from a district bordering on Dodona, got possession of the Peloponnesus, they carried with them the name Hellēnes, and their ascendancy in Greece gave it currency. The term Akhaioi fell gradually into disuse, and Hellas became the favourite name by which the Greek recognized his country.

There cannot be a doubt that the temple of the Dodonean Zeus was in Epirus. But in Il. 2. 750 mention is made of a 'Dodona the wintry,' which must have lain in Thessaly, for its waters were drained into the Penēus. I can only explain the difficulty by supposing that Dodona was a name originally given to a wide extent of country, perhaps to the whole highland region stretching from the plain of Thessaly westward to the Adriatic. The custom of forming duplicate names was so common in ancient times, and the name of Dodona was so ancient, that I should have little difficulty in looking upon it as one of them, and ranking it with such terms as Leleges, Ararat, &c. Almost all the early languages of Europe, Celtic, Teutonic, &c., contain some word answering to *don*, a hill, so that Do-don-a might well signify the hills, the highlands. As time advanced,

[1] Clemens of Alexandria speaks of the tangled hair, the long nails, and the filthy garments of the heathen priests, and this amid all the civilization of the second century.

the name may have been restricted to that portion of the district which superstition had hallowed with so many sacred associations; and Dodona, instead of being a name for the whole highland district, may have been looked upon as a designation of the temple which had made that district famous.

Aristotle (Meteor. I. 14) places Hellas in the parts about Dodona and the Achelous, and says it was inhabited by 'the Selloi, who were formerly called Graikoi, but now Hellēnes.' Hence it would seem that, like Hesiod, he gave the name of Dodona to the temple, just as the capital of the Peloponnesian *argos* was called Argos from the district in which it was situated. The name of Hellas, on the contrary, instead of contracting enlarged its area. Originally it must have signified the country of the Helloi (p. 271), just as Troas signified the country of the Tro-es, and Milu-as the country of the Miluai, and must have been confined to the immediate neighbourhood of the temple and its lake. By degrees it came to be applied to a wider area, and Aristotle, as we have seen, made it reach the Achelous. It was finally employed in popular usage to denote the whole of Greece.

Of all the conjectures that have been hazarded to explain the term Pelasgoi, the most plausible is that which connects it with the word *palaios*, ancient.[1] On this hypothesis Pelasgoi would mean the old people, the ancient tribes. The Greek term Graikoi and the Latin Graeci must be derived from the adjective *Graius*, Grecian, which survived in the Latin. This Latin adjective must surely be the same word as the Greek adjective *graios*, old, and Graikoi must, like Pelasgoi, have meant the old tribes; those who in the mountains maintained the simplicity of the older times which had been lost by the more civilized inhabitants of the plain.

The classical authors often contrast the tribes that lived on the natural produce of the earth with the civilized agri-

[1] See above, p. 91.

culturist; the latter owed the blessings he enjoyed to the beneficent influences that emanated from Eleusis—to Dēmēter or Triptolemus—the former were 'Pelasgoi' and are generally represented as connected with Dodona. We have already seen Homer coupling together the terms 'Dodonean' and 'Pelasgic[1],' and Strabo (7. 7. 10) has preserved a verse of Hesiod which expressly assigns Dodona to the Pelasgoi:

> 'He was come to Dodona and the Phegos—the seat of the Pelasgoi.'

Here Phēgos represents not a beech-tree, but the oracular oak of Dodona, which was probably a specimen of the Italian oak that produces edible acorns — the Quercus Aesculus of botanists. It would seem that, according to tradition, the district which originally bore the name of Dodona abounded in forests of this tree.

> 'Prima Ceres (Dēmētēr) ferro mortales vertere terram
> Instituit; cum jam glandes atque arbuta sacrae
> Deficerent sylvae, et victum Dodona negaret.'—Geor. 1. 147.

The same tradition was no doubt floating before the mind of Sidonius Apollinaris, when (Epp. lib. 6. ep. 12) he likened a charitable pope who distributed corn during a famine to Triptolemus, who dispensed the same blessing to rude races sprung from Dodona (rudes adhuc et Dodonigenas gentes). Triptolemus, in the Homeric Hymn to Dēmētēr, figures as one of the citizens of Eleusis, who welcomed the goddess when she first arrived there; and according to Servius (Geor. 1. 19) he was the son of Eleusinus—Eleusinus being of course a personification of Eleusis, where was the great temple of Dēmētēr. Again, Pausanias tells us (8. 4. 1) that Pelasgos taught the inhabitants of Arcadia to build huts and make garments, but that his descendant Arcas, from whom they got the name of Arcades, first taught them the art of making bread,[2] which he had learnt from Triptolemus. Both in Latin and Greek legend we commonly find the

[1] See p. 270.

[2] The oracle called the Arcadians 'acorn eaters.'—Herod. 1. 66.

earlier and ruder races connected with Dodona and the Pelasgoi, while the later races are connected with Eleusis and the foreign civilization which seems to have centred there.

Herodotus represents the Pelasgoi as a people speaking a peculiar language. He tells us (1. 57) that the Athenians no longer spoke Pelasgic, such as was spoken by the men of Plakiē and Skulakē in Troas, who once lived in Attica, or by the men of Crēstōnē who came from Thessaly, but that the men of these towns were mutually intelligible to each other. This last fact may admit of the following explanation. The men of Plakiē and Skulakē were no doubt a portion of the Pelasgoi who figured as the allies of Priam (Il. 2. 840); and Crēstōnē lay in Thrace, in the heart of the district conquered by the Teukroi and Musoi before the fall of Troy. The inhabitants of all these places had, when Herodotus wrote, been living for centuries apart from the kindred races, and withdrawn from the general current of Greek thought and feeling. While other Greek races were passing through different phases of civilization, Akhaiic or Hellenic, and gradually forming the dialects which Greek literature has handed down to us, *these*, surrounded by foreign influences, seemed to have preserved with little change the speech of their forefathers. Leleges and Pelasgoi were elsewhere becoming Aeolians, Dorians, and the other Greek races, whose names are so familiar to us, while the men of these isolated districts remained stationary, and gradually came to be looked upon as the scattered remnants of a bygone people.

If the Dodanim took the name of Hellenes from the religious centre where they were wont to congregate, we might expect that the names of some of the other early Greek races would admit of explanation on the same principle. It is maintained by Bochart, and is generally admitted by recent expositors, that Elishah personified the tribes that in early times dwelt in the Peloponnesus and its neighbourhood. 'Blue and purple' (Ezekiel 27. 7) were brought

from the 'isles of Elishah,' and the seas of Laconia were celebrated for their purple dyes (Paus. 3. 21). The rites of Dēmētēr according to Herodotus (2. 171) were introduced from Egypt by the daughters of Danaus, and though generally discontinued after the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnesus, still prevailed in Arcadia, where the old inhabitants had managed to retain their ancient seats. I think the statement of Herodotus must be taken with some qualification. Statues of Dēmētēr are found surrounded with the attributes of Isis, but there are several circumstances which tend to show that her worship was not brought *directly* from Egypt. It was however adopted by the Danaoi so soon after their migration to Greece, that they may have been looked upon as having introduced it.

In various scholia the name of the eponymous hero of Eleusis sometimes appears as Eleusi-s, which probably answers to the Hebrew Elishah, of which Hellēs[1] may be a variant form. May we venture to conjecture that Hellēspontos meant the sea of Hellēs, and that eastern Greece, or, in other words, the Greece washed by the Aegean, was known as Helles, while the Greece bordering on the Adriatic was better known as the Dodon[1] or Highlands (p. 271)?

Suidas quotes Aristophanes to show that Akhaia was one of the names of Dēmētēr, and he suggests *akhos*, grief, as its root—the sorrowing goddess. At Athens was a temple dedicated to Akhaia Dēmētēr (Herod. 5. 61), but it was at Eleusis, midway between the Akhaioi of the Peloponnesus and the Akhaioi living north of the isthmus, that Dēmētēr had her great temple, and here the mysterious rites were celebrated which made the goddess famous. We may understand therefore how Moses came to select the term Elishah (Eleusis), to personify the powerful tribes that were specially devotees of this goddess. In the time of Moses the Akhaioi must have been gradually working their way

[1] It need hardly be mentioned that this name Hellēs was an entirely different word from Hellas (p. 271).

to that ascendancy in Greece which they afterwards acquired, and which in the age of Homer was so marked as to justify him in using the term Akhaioi as a general name for the Greek people.

We have already noticed the hospitality which the Athenians extended to the Gephuraioi, the Kadmean tribe which was driven from Tanagra by the Boeotians. They were admitted conditionally into Athens, and allowed to erect there a temple to Akhaia Dēmētēr. After the Dorians had conquered the Peloponnesus, the antagonism between the Akhaians and the Dorians seems to have recommended the former to the good graces of the Athenians, and will in some measure account for the favour shown by the latter to the Gephuraioi. At an earlier period the Athenians were stoutly opposed to the Akhaian propagandism, and one of the earliest events which loom through the mythical ages of the far-famed city is the war it had to maintain against Eleusis and the Eumolpidai, the priestly sect who ministered to the foreign worship established there.

The earliest notice of Athens that has come down to us is found in the Iliad (2. 546):—

'They who Athēnai possessed, that well-built city,
The city of Erekhtheus the high-minded, whom once Athēnē
Brought up Zeus' daughter (but the fruitful earth was parent),
And in Athēnai placed him in her own rich temple,
There with bulls and lambs appease him
The sons of the Athēnaioi as years roll round,
These led there Menestheus, son of Peteus;
Like to him on earth was no man
To marshal horse and men with shields protected,' &c.

The war between Erekhtheus and the men of Eleusis, &c., headed by Eumolpus, is mentioned by Thucydides (2. 15). Eumolpus (i.e. the sweet singer) is generally represented as the son of Poseidōn, and according to Hyginus (Fab. 46) he made war to support Poseidōn's claim to supremacy at Athens. Eumolpus was aided by Thracians (Str. 7. 7. 1), and as Socrates is made to say in the Memorabilia of

Xenophon (3. 5. 10) by the men of 'the whole adjoining continent.' The Eumolpidai, the reputed descendants of Eumolpus, discharged the priestly office at Eleusis down to a late period, and Herodotus tells us (8. 55) that in the acropolis at Athens was 'the temple of Erekhtheus,' who is said to have been earth-born, wherein was the olive tree and the sea (salt-well) which, the report is, Poseidōn and Athēnē left as a witness for the Athenians when they contended for the country, &c.

A fair consideration of these *mythi* will, I think, lead us to the conclusion that at some remote period there was at Athens a struggle between two rival religious systems—the worship of Neith (Athēnē), introduced from Sais by 'earth-born,' that is native Greeks, and that of Dēmētēr, established at Eleusis by foreigners, or, in mythological phrase, by the sons of Poseidōn. The struggle seems to have ended in a compromise. The Athenians, though they never became Åkhaioi, tolerated the worship of Akhaia as a subordinate *cultus*; and at a later period of their history supported the sanctuary at Eleusis with all their power and influence. Indeed, so dependent on Athenian patronage did the worship of Dēmētēr become, after the Dorians established their supremacy in the Peloponnesus, that in the later mythologies we find the mythus of Erekhtheus and Poseidōn entirely changing its character. Certain mythologists represent the god and hero as connected by the closest ties, and by some they are actually identified. Still the old mythus kept its ground in Attica, and Pausanias (1. 31. 3) was shown the grave of Ion son of Xuthus, who 'led the Athenians in the war against the men of Eleusis'—when Ion represents the ancient Iones or Pelasgoi, from whom the Athenians were descended. The determination with which the Athenians upheld the worship of Athēnē, when nearly all their neighbours had adopted that of the rival goddess, explains the interest with which the priests of Sais watched the fortunes of the Greek city.

It is matter of interest to ascertain how far Homer

recognized a distinction between the two great divisions of the Grecian world, the Hellenes and the Akhaioi, or to use Scriptural language between Dodanim and Elishah. The Hellenes in the time of Homer held so subordinate a place in Grecian politics, and their country was so remote from the district in which the Iliad must, on any hypothesis, have originated, that we need not be surprised at finding the references to them fewer and slighter than their subsequent renown might lead us to expect. I incline however to think that in the Iliad a distinction *is* drawn between the two races, and moreover that they were in Homer's day looked upon as together forming the great body of the Greek people, and as such distinguished from the kindred tribes whom foreign influences and other circumstances had in earlier times separated from their brethren. The word *argos* in the Thessalian and Macedonian dialects signified a plain (Strabo 8. 6. 9); and the name was applied to several districts, of which two of the most important were the argos of the Peloponnesus and the argos of Thessaly. The former is called by Homer the Akhaiic (Il. 9. 141), and the latter the Pelasgic argos (Il. 2. 681). The attribution of the term Akhaiic to the former district shows us that in Homer's time its inhabitants were looked upon as being in an especial manner Akhaioi. But there were Akhaioi in other parts of Greece, and in Thessaly we find them brought into connexion with Hellenes. Achilles was lord of the Pelasgic argos, of Alos, Alopē, Trakhin, and Hellas, and his people were called Murmidones, Hellēnes, and Akhaioi (Il. 2. 684). The Hellēnes here mentioned were no doubt the mountaineers of Hellas, that is of the district lying west of Thessaly, and closely connected with Dodona; the Akhaioi were probably the people of the coast district, for on the coast of Thessaly near Pyrasos was a temple of Dēmēter (Il. 2. 695), and, where Akhaia was worshipped—in that neighbourhood must have lived Akhaioi. The Akhaioi at that time represented the civilization of Greece, and the name

seems to have been affected by the ruling classes even in Hellas. Achilles tells Ulysses (Il. 9. 395)—

> 'Many Akhaian women there are in Hellas and Phthiē
> Daughters of Chiefs.

After the Dorian invasion the fashion changed, and Hellenes became the favourite appellation of the Greek people.

I think we have something like proof that the Hellenes and Akhaioi were, in the time of Homer, looked upon as forming the two main divisions of the Greek people, in the fact that he uses such phrases as Panakhaioi (Il. 2. 404 and 7. 73) and Panellēnes, i. e. the whole body of the Akhaioi, and the whole body of the Hellēnes. It is true he uses the term Panakhaioi to signify the Greeks in general, but the same meaning he also gives to the name Akhaioi and evidently for the same reason, viz. because the Akhaioi were in his day predominant in Greece. The term Panellēnes is found only once in the Iliad, and the passage in which it occurs (Il. 2. 530) has been the subject of sceptical criticism. When Hesiod (Op. et Dies, 526) spoke of the sun as visiting the dark-coloured races and shining later on the Panellēnes, he may have been using the language of his every-day life. He was a Dorian, and may have habitually used the terms to designate the races that claimed Hellenic descent, and were akin to the Dorians. But when the word appears in the Iliad, it will not admit of this explanation, and Alexandrian critics rejected the passage referred to because it contained this word Panellēnes. I think however it may admit of being defended on critical grounds. The lesser Ajax was lord of the Lokroi, and the Lokroi are described by Homer (Il. 13. 714) as having neither shield nor helmet. They seem to have been mere archers, light-armed troops like the western Lokroi in the time of Thucydides (1. 5). But their leader Ajax, though he retained the linen thorax of his countrymen, fought with the spear; he is represented as

> 'clad in a linen thorax,'

but in the use of the spear he excelled Panellēnes and

Akhaioi. 'Brazen-coated' is the epithet generally applied by Homer to his countrymen, and the use of the linen thorax is specially assigned by Herodotus (7. 63) to the Assyrians. It would seem, therefore, that the Lokroi differed from the great body of the Greeks in their defensive armour, and more resembled in this respect the Asiatic races. According to Aristotle the Lokroi were Leleges, and we have seen (above, p. 270) that Hesiod made Lokros king of the Leleges. Perhaps we may conclude that Homer used the terms Panellēnes and Akhaioi in order to distinguish the Lokrian Leleges from the two predominant races which at that period were looked upon as forming the Greek nation. Akhaioi was a term often used with a general signification, and the collective term Panellēnes may have been deliberately adopted in order to prevent the reader, or rather we should say the hearer, from confining the term Hellēnes to the inhabitants of Hellas proper.

The changes of meaning through which the terms Hellas and Hellēnes passed indicate the progress of the most remarkable revolution—social and political—to which the Greeks were subjected. The phrase used in the Odyssey (1. 344 and 15. 80) 'through Hellas and mid Argos,' points, I think, to a time when the Akhaioi of Argos were still a great power in Greece, though the Hellēnes were rapidly attaining to the supremacy which was ultimately conceded to them. This is one of the circumstances which seem to me to indicate a later age for the composition of the latter poem than is usually assigned to the Iliad.

We have seen that the Lokroi were distinguished from the other Greeks by wearing the linen thorax. The little regard in which the light-armed soldier was held in the time of Homer is seen in almost every page of the Iliad. Yet it is hard to say when the heavy-armed Greek first made his appearance. The phrases which Homer uses to designate him are the 'brazen-coated' and the 'well-greaved.' Now the Egyptian soldiers are sometimes represented as

wearing scale armour, but they never wear the brazen thorax, and their mercenaries are for the most part lightly armed. The oracle which promised Psammetichus the aid of 'brazen men' (Herod. 2. 152) shows how strange must have been the sight of brazen armour at that time in Egypt. Goliath of Gath (1 Sam. 17. 6) had greaves of brass, at least so our Version renders the word *mitzkhah*, and I think rightly. Instead of a brazen cuirass he seems to have had a coat of scale armour, and a 'kidon' between his shoulders. Our translators sometimes make the 'kidon' a buckler, and sometimes a spear. I believe it always meant a buckler. When Joshua gave the signal for the ambush to rise against Ai, he stretched out his *kidon* towards the doomed city (Josh. 8. 18). Our translators thinking the spear a more suitable weapon for the purpose make him 'stretch out the spear that he had in his hand towards the city.' But among the Greeks the raising of the shield was a signal for proceeding to battle (Herod. 6. 115, Diod. 20. 51); and we may suppose that the Greeks borrowed this, as they did so many of their other customs, from the older races. The *kidon* which Goliath bore between his shoulders was probably his buckler or smaller shield, and the *tzinnah* carried by his shield-bearer the huge shield covering the soldier from head to foot, which we see represented on Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. The *tzinnah* must have been at least twice as large as the ordinary Jewish shield, the *magen* (2 Chron. 9. 15, 16), and if we follow the reading in 1 Kings 10. 15 it must have been four or five times as large. Instead of this cumbersome protection, the Greek adopted the serviceable *aspis*, the round brazen basin-like shield which Greek art has made familiar to us—so large that it sufficiently covered the body, and not so heavy but that it might be carried without unduly fatiguing the bearer. The dead or wounded soldier was carried on his *aspis*, and to lose it entailed infamy. The reader will remember the parting words of the Spartan mother to her son 'with it or upon it.' At the time Homer flourished, which we may

loosely fix at about the year 900 B.C., the Greeks must have adopted in its entirety the brazen armour which made them the most formidable warriors of the period.

Josephus supposes (Ant. I. 6. 1) Elishah to represent the Aioleis. He was evidently led to this conclusion by the resemblance between the names, though the resemblance extends only to the first syllable. The same kind of criticism led him to identify Tarshish with Tarsos in Cilicia, though the last syllable of Tars-os is a mere nominatival ending, and we have no reason to believe that Greeks were settled in Cilicia till a comparatively late period. When the Kilikes conquered and gave a name to this country, the people they expelled were Suroi or Arimaioi (Str. 13. 4. 6) not Greeks. Though Tars-os cannot represent the Hebrew word Tarshish, there is a perfect correspondence between Tarshish and Tartess-us, the name of the celebrated emporium near Cadiz, for the sibilation of the dental is one of the most characteristic of the Hebrew letter-changes. How Moses came to locate Greeks in this remote corner of Europe is the difficult question we have now to investigate.

I cannot help thinking that Plato believed the story of the Atlantis, as detailed in the Timaeus, to be genuine history. He makes Critias say that, strange though it was, the tale was a true one; that it was told by Solon to his great grandfather, with whom Solon, as appears from his poems, lived on terms of intimacy and friendship; and Critias further states, that when a boy of ten, he heard it repeated by his grandfather at one of the great family gatherings. The following is a summary of the story, the truth of which is vouched for on such respectable authority. Solon related that when he travelled to Sais, a city founded by the goddess, whom the Egyptians called Neith and the Greeks Athēnē, he was received with much consideration, the inhabitants being friendly to the Athenians, with whom they looked upon themselves as being in some sort connected. When conversing on the early history of Athens he was told by the priests that in such matters the Greeks

were but children, inasmuch as they had lost all their historical monuments, whereas in the Egyptian temples had been preserved memorials of past events for 9000 years previously; and that among other achievements recorded there was one in an especial manner honourable to the Athenians. At the entrance of the Atlantic was an island called Atlantis, as large as both Africa and Asia, which gave access to other islands and to the adjoining continent. This island was governed by kings who reigned over Africa as far as Egypt, and over Europe as far as the Tuscan sea. A large army proceeding from these parts was resisted by the Athenians in alliance with other Greeks, and when these deserted them by the Athenians alone. Though often driven to extremity the Athenians were at last victors in the struggle, and by their means other nations regained their liberty. The island was afterwards destroyed by an earthquake.

Plato seldom draws a clear line between his criticism and his rhetoric; and he gives a wide licence to the latter when, in the Critias (114), he returns to the story we have referred to. We are told that, when the gods divided the world among them, Poseidōn received the Atlantis as his share, and parted it among his sons Atlas, Gadeiros, Elasippos and others. The two latter names evidently originated in those the Phoenicians gave to Cadiz and Lisbon, and cannot date much earlier than the year 1000 B.C. Whether in the names I have omitted there were references to the still earlier settlements of the Greeks, is a question too difficult to be discussed incidentally.

Plutarch[1], who flourished some four or five centuries after Plato, refers to the Atlantis, to which he gives the Homeric name of Ogygia. According to this late edition of the story the island lay five days' sail west of Britain. Other islands were in its neighbourhood, in one of which, Kronos (Saturn), was imprisoned by Zeus. A continent lay beyond, but the sea was difficult to navigate, owing to the

[1] De Facie in orbe Lunae, 26. 2.

mud, &c. On the shores were settled Greeks [1], according to whose report, those who accompanied Hēraklēs united with the people of Kronos, and thus saved the land from being overrun by barbarians ; hence among them Hēraklēs obtained the first and Kronos the second place. In the land where the Greeks lived the sun for the space of thirty days was hid for one hour only after setting.

When the priests of Sais told Solon that it was the Athenians who resisted the Africans and saved Europe from their yoke, we must not suppose that they were referring solely to the men of Attica. The Athenians they referred to were probably all the Greek tribes that worshipped Athēnē, just as in Homer's time all the Greek tribes that worshipped Akhaia were called Akhaioi in whatever part of Greece they lived. The goddess of Sais was worshipped at an early period beyond the limits of Egypt. We find her symbol tattooed on the bodies of the Tamahu, who lived on the African coast west of the Nile, and we find Athēnē, who is the Greek representative of Neith, figuring in some of the oldest Greek legends that have come down to us. The first thing done by Danaus after his flight from Egypt, was to build a temple to this goddess, and it was Athēnē who aided Cadmus when he was building Thebes (see p. 244). Homer makes Priam the grandson of Erikhthonius (Il. 20. 219); and the mythologists generally considered Erikhthonius to be the same person as Erekhtheus, whom Athēnē adopted and brought up in her temple at Athens [2]. The Palladium, on the preservation of which, according to the authority of the same mythologist, the fate of Troy depended, was an image of this goddess. In other parts of Greece besides Attica we find Athēnē a subject of special worship, and this was particularly the case in districts which prided themselves on their antiquity and the purity of their descent. Troizen, in the Argolis, was one of the oldest towns of the Peloponnesus, and, though in Homer's day subject to Argos (Il. 2. 561), it was in origin and in senti-

[1] Plutarch, ib. 5–8. [2] See p. 276.

ment an Ionian town like Athens. At Troizen was current the same mythus respecting the combat between Athēnē and Poseidōn as at Athens (Paus. 2. 30), and at Troizen was born and educated the great hero of Athenian mythology, Theseus. Kunouria was another very ancient district in the Peloponnesus, and its inhabitants are called by Herodotus (8. 73) Autokhthones and Iones. In their territory was a place called Athēnē[1] (Paus. 2. 38. 6), whence we may conclude that they also worshipped the same goddess as the men of Athens. These old towns stand out like relics of the past, to show the religious level whence the rest of Greece had drifted. We might almost be tempted to divide the history of Greece into three portions, the Athenaic, the Akhaiic, and the Hellenic—the last treating of the classical Greece with which we are all familiar, the second of Greece immediately preceding the age of Homer, and the first of the early prehistoric Greece, whose faint outlines we are now endeavouring to trace.

I did not quote[2] from the Iliad with the view of *proving* that Menestheus led Athenians to the siege of Troy. On this point there might be difference of opinion; but no one will doubt that when the Iliad was recited at the great festivals the audience *believed* Menestheus to have been a great Athenian leader in the Heroic age. Now in Ptolemy we find a place situate near Cadiz, and called Menestheus' Port, which has been identified with the town usually called Baesippo; and Strabo tells us (3. 1. 9, p. 140) that in these parts was the oracle of Menestheus; and to Menestheus the Athenian, as Philostratus (Apollon. 5. 4) asserts, the men of Cadiz offered sacrifices. Strabo (3. 4. 3, p. 157) quotes Asclepiades who had taught 'grammar' in Turdetania, as an authority for saying that 'among the Kallaïkoi dwelt some of those who had served with Teucer, and that there were certain cities, one of which was named Hellenes and another Amphilokhoi, &c., and he says he learnt that certain

[1] In our editions of Thucydides, 5. 41, this place is called Anthene.
[2] Above, p. 276.

of those who went with Heraklēs, and of those from Messene, settled in Iberia; and both he and others assert that the Lacones occupy a portion of Kantabria.' Justin also (44. 3) tells us that the Gallaeci claimed a Greek descent, and that in their country was a settlement which bore the name of Teucer, and also a district called Amphilochi. Again, Timagenes the Syrian, who lived in the first century, first at Alexandria and afterwards at Rome, and who collected from such sources as were within his reach various accounts of the *Origines* of the Galli, tells us (Amm. Marc. 15. 9) 'that the Dorians who followed the more ancient Hercules settled the districts bordering on the Ocean.' The phrase 'the more ancient Hercules,' must have been used to prevent any confusion between him and the Hercules of Roman legend, who seems chiefly to have personified the later conquests of the Phoenicians.

Among the Greek writers of the Augustan age Strabo carefully distinguished between the conquests of Heraklēs and those of the Phoenicians. He speaks (1. 1. 4, p. 2) of 'the Iberic wealth in quest of which Heraklēs made an expedition, and *afterwards* the Phoenicians;' and he elsewhere distinguishes between the two expeditions (3. 2. 13, p. 149). No such clear distinction is drawn by Diodorus or Dionysius. The first of these writers was a Sicilian, and lived long in Rome, where also the latter resided during the last thirty years of his life; and their accounts of Heraklēs and his adventures were probably only different editions of the Greek mythus as it was accepted in Italy. Thus modified it seems to take in both the later Phoenician conquests, and also many Italian legends. According to Diodorus (4. 17) Heraklēs carried an army from Crete to Iberia, and after the conquest of that country marched into Gaul, where he built Alesia, which long continued to be the capital of Gaul, and was never taken till the conquest of Gaul by Caesar. From Gaul he passed over the Alps into Italy. According to Dionysius (1. 34) Heraklēs, after the conquest of Iberia and the western districts, brought his army, consisting of

Peloponnesians and certain Trojans, into Italy, where many of them settled. In this expedition he was fiercely opposed by the Ligures of whom Aeschylus wrote, &c.

The Greek and Phoenician Herakles are so mixed up together in Roman legend, that it is difficult to separate them. The early Greeks make their Herakles a native hero. We find the story growing as time advances, but the mythus is Greek in its essential features as long as the hands of genuine Greeks are fashioning it. When the Latins took up the story the Heraklean Greeks—if we may coin a term—had almost faded away from western Europe; and the Latins seem to have looked upon the mythus as belonging less to the Greeks than to their successors the Phoenicians. The progress of Phoenician civilization in western Europe had already, thanks to the Greek colony at Marseilles, left some mark on Greek literature. Aristotle (De Mirab. Ausc. 85) speaks of the Heraklean way that led from Italy to the Celts and Iberes, which shows us, by the way, that even at that early period the Alps were habitually traversed by the trader. Again, the stony plain called the Krau, at the mouth of the Rhone, is generally considered to be the place where Herakles gained his victory over the Ligures[1], Zeus pouring down the stones to effect their discomfiture. There is a stony plain lying east of the Lejah in Syria called El Krâ; if *Krau* and *Krâ* be the same word, then Krau must be one of the few Phoenician terms that have been preserved in the topography of Gaul.

As the story is told in the Iliad, Heraklēs was born at Thebes, the son of Alkmēnē (19. 99) wife of Amphitruōn. Like most of the deified heroes of the Homeric poems he was 'a son of Zeus'; but he is also represented as the son of Amphitruōn (5. 392). When the time of his birth drew nigh, it was announced by Zeus that a man was about to appear who should be the head of all those who were of his blood (19. 104). Upon this Hera (19. 117) hastened to Argos and prematurely brought on the birth of Eurystheus,

[1] Bouquet, Recueil des Historiens des Gaules, i. 53.

son of Sthenelus, who like Amphitruōn was a Perseid, and consequently a descendant of Zeus. Thus Heraklēs lost his birthright, and was subject to the orders of his relative Eurystheus, by whose command he fetched from Erebos the Dog of Hades (8. 368). He is represented as having conquered Pylos (11. 689), Ephyra in the Selleeis (2. 659), and Ilion, the city of Laomedon, though he attacked the latter with only six ships and a few men (5. 641). On his return from Ilion he was driven far from his course by his great enemy Hera, but was safely brought back to Argos by Zeus. Here we seem to have a mythus which admits of the explanation that the rulers of Thebes were unwillingly subject to those of Argos, and oppressed by the lords of that city, or in mythological language by Hera, the great goddess of Argos. In this its earliest form, the mythus of Herakles is made up in great measure of ordinary adventure, but in the later editions the marvellous largely predominates. The Theogony (287) first mentions the adventure with Gēruōn.

'And Khrusaōr begat the three-headed Gēruoneus
In embrace with Kalirrhoē, daughter of the far-famed Ocean;
Him the strength of Heraklēs bereft of life
Alongside the slow-footed oxen in the water-girdled Erutheia,
The day when he drave away the large-fronted oxen
To holy Tiruns, having crossed the path of the Ocean
And slain Orthos and the herdsman Eurutuōn,
In the cloudy stalls beyond the far-famed ocean.'

Here the poet must have had in view the dark and cloudy region where the author of the Odyssey located his Kimmerioi (see above, p. 8). Attempts were made in a later age to identify Erutheia with the island of Cadiz, or with some other locality known in Roman times. But those who ventured on these speculations forgot they were dealing with legend and mythus, with matters, in short, which were little more than the shadows of history. We may reasonably consider Erutheia to be a derivative of *eruth-ros*, red; and as Egyptian legend represented a struggle between Greeks and Africans as one of the earliest events that

had occurred in this remote region, we may conjecture that Erutheia meant merely the red land, the country of the swarthy Africans. The story of this island may have originated in some faint recollection of the lost Atlantis.

The obscure and difficult questions we are investigating engaged, though only incidentally, the attention of one of the keenest intellects Rome ever produced. Sallust served under Caesar in an African campaign, and was afterwards governor of Numidia. He tells us (B. Jug. 17) that he talked with the people on the subject of their origin, and consulted the Carthaginian books 'which are called King Hiempsal's.'[1] The result of his inquiries may be summed up as follows. The earliest inhabitants of Africa were the Gaetuli and the Libyes; and after that Hercules 'had perished in Spain as the Afri believe,' the various tribes forming his army separated under their respective leaders, and 'the Medi, Persae, and Armenii,' sailed to Africa—the Persae settling among the Gaetuli on the shores of the western ocean, and the Medi and Armenii among the Libyes. He tells us that the Persae and Gaetuli gradually obtained an ascendency over the whole country, and founded the people called the Numidae, and that the Phoenices afterwards founded on the coast the cities Hippo, Hadrumetum, Leptis, and others.

When Sallust spake of Hercules as perishing in Spain according to African belief, he was evidently comparing the African mythus with that which was accepted among his own countrymen. According to the Roman mythus Hercules proceeded from Spain to Gaul and thence to Italy, and it clearly referred to Phoenician conquests. The African mythus, on the contrary, referred to the first Hercules, that is, as it would seem, to the earlier conquests of

[1] On the destruction of Carthage the Romans gave the contents of the public libraries to their allies the Numidian chiefs, Mago's work on agriculture excepted, which was carried to Rome (Plin. 18. 5. 3). King Hiempsal's books were probably some of the Carthaginian MSS. so disposed of.

the Greeks and their confederates. The Libyes and Gaetuli, whom the Africans considered to be the original inhabitants of their country, seem to be the two races known in Scripture as the Lehabim and Phut. It is certainly strange to our modern notions to find Medi, Persae, and Armenii, playing such a part in the west of Europe at so early a period; but the statement of Sallust is clear and precise, and demands explanation of some kind or other, for no honest inquirer will venture to ignore it. We have seen (p. 232) how intimate were the relations that existed between the Amazones and the Sauromatai, or northern Medes. The Medes were distinguished from the Persians at an early period, yet so interwoven are the histories of the two races that it is difficult to look on them as other than different branches of one common stock; indeed some ancient writers seem to consider the terms as interchangeable. Now the early Amazones are represented as a wandering predatory people overrunning Asia Minor, and according to Norris the Assyrian word *parzi* signified captains (פרז). May not the leaders of those bands have been known as *parzi* among the Shemitic races they were plundering; may it not have been given to the districts where they finally settled with their followers? According to De Rougé, the name of *Mede* was given to certain of the Egyptian mercenaries as early as the 'Old Monarchy.' We need not, therefore, feel surprise if in the following legends we find the names Amazones, Medi, and Persae occasionally doing duty the one for the other.

The Dionysius, so often quoted by the Scholiast who annotated Apollonius Rhodius, tells us (Apoll. Rhod. 2. 965) that the Amazones went to Africa and conquered the *Atlantic State*, which was the most powerful state in that quarter, and on their return built several cities in Europe. This Dionysius wrote on Dionusos and the Amazones and the Argonauts (Diod. 3. 52), and seems to have been the chief authority relied on by Diodorus and his contemporaries for the history of these early ages. Few or no

details of the life and labours of this writer have come down to us. The people whom he calls the Amazones were, I have little doubt, the same who figure in the Hieroglyphic inscriptions as the Mashawasha. Instead of Mashawasha we sometimes find the name written Mashawa-u (Brugsch, Geog. Inschr. 2. 80), where *u* is evidently the Egyptian plural-ending used as a suffix; and if *u* be a suffix in Mashawa-u we may reasonably conclude that *sha* is also a suffix in Mashawa-sha, though in this latter combination we are unable to explain its meaning.

Brugsch considered the Mashawasha to be the same people as the Maxues whom Herodotus (4. 191) locates west of the Syrtes, and whom he distinguishes from the nomade tribes around them, as being an agricultural people with fixed abodes. Herodotus tells us they let their hair grow on the right side of the head, but cut it on the left; that they stained their bodies and represented themselves as being descended from the Trojans. As some eight or nine centuries must have elapsed, since the Egyptians depicted the Mashawasha on the walls of their temples, when Herodotus thus described them, we must be prepared for the differences we find between their pictures and his description. The supposed descent of the Mashawasha from the Trojans may admit of the following explanation. The later epics on the fall of Troy represent Penthesilea, Queen of the Amazones, as bringing her people to its relief, and falling there by the hand of Achilles. In the time of Herodotus the whole coast west of Egypt seems to have been more or less Hellenized, and when talking to a Greek the Mashawasha would naturally point to this portion of the Homeric cycle as illustrating their name and race. From this circumstance alone came, I believe, the story of their Trojan descent. The Maxues were called by Hecataeus Mazues (vide Steph. Byz.), and by Latin writers Mazaces[1] or Mazikoi[2]. Ptolemy locates the Mazikoi east

[1] Lucan, Phars. 4. 681; Suet. Nero, 30.

[2] Amm. Marc. 29. 5.

of Mauritania; and Iarbas, the Gaetulian chief who persecuted poor Dido with his love (Aen. 4. 326), is represented by the mythologists as a son of Ammon, and by Greek antiquaries as 'king of the Nomades and Mazikoi.' In this name Mazikoi the reader will probably recognize that of Amazigh, a name affected by several of the Berber races, and which some philologists have adopted as a general term whereby to designate the Berber dialects.

The Amazones of Africa are generally called Persai in Greek literature. I am no more able to explain the origin of the name Persai than of the term Amazones; but there is little doubt that both names were used by the early Greeks to designate the people whose history we are now investigating. Apollodorus (2. 4. 3) thus dresses up the mythus, describing their first settlement in Africa. When Kēpheus was king of the Aithiopes, a certain monster desolated the country, and Kēpheus was ordered by the god Ammon to expose his daughter Andromeda in order to put a stop to its ravages. Perseus slew the monster, married Andromeda, and succeeded to her father's kingdom. According to Herodotus (7. 61) 'they (the Persai) were called by the Greeks Kephēnes, and by themselves and neighbours Artaioi; but after Perseus, son of Danae and Zeus, came to Kēpheus, son of Belus, and married his daughter Andromeda, a son was born to him whom he named Persēs and left in that country, as Kēpheus had no male issue. From him the Persai got their name.'

It would be quite consistent with these mythi to suppose that the Persae went to the 'Atlantic State' as friends and allies rather than as enemies, but it is plainly indicated that they ultimately supplanted the people they came to serve. The mythus handed down to us by Herodotus is interesting, inasmuch as it distinguishes between Perses and Perseus, that is, between the Persians of Africa and the Persians who in after ages gained a renown in Asia, which eclipsed even that which they had acquired previously. The Persian conquests in Africa were referred to

in the Augustan age as matters of familiar history, and the traces they left behind them in that country still afford a subject of speculation to some of the African races.

In the classical times there was a people called Pharusii who dwelt in the west of Africa (Mela 4), and according to Pliny (5. 8) these 'Pharusii, formerly Persae, are said to have been the companions of Hercules,' in which he agrees with Solinus, who tells us (24. 12) that the summits of Mount Atlas had only been reached by Perseus and Hercules. The Persae seem to have gradually penetrated more deeply into Africa, and even to have crossed the Sahara. According to Strabo (17. 3. 3), Pharousioi with Nigritai destroyed no less than 300 Tyrian settlements on the coast; and, exaggerated though the account may be, it is clear that the Pharousioi must at an early period have been well established, and possessed of a widespread influence in Negroland. In that district we still find light-coloured races—Foulahs, Ovas, Fellatahs, and others—markedly distinguished from the Negroes, among whom they live; and traditions still exist which attribute to some of them a Persian descent. The curious work of Sultan Bello on the geography of central Africa represents certain districts as still inhabited by 'Sarankali or Persians.'[1]

We have seen above that classical mythology made Hercules a companion of Perseus, in the conquest of North Africa. But the ascendency of the Persians became so great as to throw into the shade the confederate races; and even the glory of the Grecian hero paled before it. According to Varro (Plin. 3. 1), 'Iberi and Persae and Phoenices and Celtae and Poeni came into Spain.' I believe Varro here ranged in their proper order what he considered to be the several races that successively became predominant in Spain. We observe there is no mention made of the Greeks, and that the Persae are treated as if they were the representatives of all the races that accompanied 'the first Hercules.' It is probable that these confederated

[1] Denham and Clapperton's Travels, App. p. 166.

races came into Spain not long before the year 1500 B.C., and after driving out the Africans were ruined by their intestine divisions. The Phoenicians seem to have gained a footing in the country some four or five centuries later. The Poeni or Carthaginians appeared in Spain in the fifth century B.C., and were gradually bringing the Celtiberians under subjection, when, in the second century B.C., both Celtiberians and Carthaginians were obliged to yield to the power of Rome and the genius of the Scipios.

On the breaking up of the confederacy which expelled the Africans from Spain, the Persae, we are told, settled among the Gaetuli, forming with them a mixed people known in history as the Numidae. I suspect that the people whom the Persae subdued and mixed with were the same as figure in the hieroglyphic inscriptions as the Kufa. In a well-known inscription at Thebes (Brugsch, Geog. Inschr. 2. 3) the god Ammon promises Ramses III the lands of the south, and then promises spoil and conquest in three other quarters of the world—'I turn my look eastward,' bringing forward as a subject-race the Pount, 'northward' pointing to the *ta deser* and the *ta neter*, i.e. to the red land and the holy land, 'westward' citing before the favoured monarch the vanquished Tahennu. A more ancient monument represents men bringing tribute to Thothmes III from the land of the south (*ta u ra*) from the lands of the Pount, of the Rutennu, and of the Kufa. The Pount are now by general agreement located in southern Arabia, and they must have been the same people as the Eruthraioi of Greek geography. The Rutennu are generally supposed to be an Assyrian people. Hence it would seem that the Pharaoh received homage and tribute from the men of the south, of the east, of the north—and of the Kufa, who appear to occupy the place of the Tahennu or westerns of the later inscription. The Kufa were in all probability a Berber-people; both they and the Pount are represented as red men.

We have seen reasons for believing that the Amazones or Persai communicated their name to the subject-race, and

that the Berber title Amazigh is in some way connected with that of Amazones, so celebrated in classical mythology. Nothing is more common in history than the transference of name from the ruling to the subject-race, and equally common is the transference from the subject race to their rulers. We have seen that the Greeks at first called the Persai Kēphēnes (p. 292). Kēphenes must be derived from Kēpheus, which we may reasonably consider to be an eponym for the Kufa. Kufa, under the form of Chub, seems to have been used by Ezekiel (30. 5) to denote the Persai. When denouncing Egypt he makes her friends the partners of her ruin. Aethiopia (Cush), and Libya (Phut), and Lydia (Lud), and all the mingled people (Ereb), and Chub, &c., shall fall with her by the sword. The Septuagint renders the passage: 'Persai and Krētes, and Ludoi and Libues, and all the mingled people, &c., shall fall,' &c.

The Septuagint may be considered as a Targum or interpretation, intended to bring the meaning of their Scriptures within reach of the Hellenized Jews, who swarmed in Alexandria. The Egyptian Targumists seem often to have had great difficulty in rendering into suitable Greek the geographical terms they met with in the Hebrew. In the second and third centuries B.C. the Greek phrase Libues was very vaguely used, and might be rendered the Africans, in which sense it may have been looked upon as an equivalent for Cush; Ludoi of course answered to the Hebrew Lud; Krētes, I suspect, was intended to represent Phut, for the original population of Crete was probably Berber, and from their settlement in Southern Palestine the Kretes must have been well known in Egypt, and therefore may have been selected as the representatives of the Berber-family. Chub may answer to the Egyptian name Kufa, and this name may have been given first to the Berbers settled on the southern coast of the Mediterranean, and then to the intrusive race that subdued them. As Kephēnes was the Greek name for this people, so Koub or Chub seems to have conveyed the same meaning to the Greek-speaking Jews

for whom the Septuagint was written. It is the only way in which I can account for the intrusion of the word Persai into this passage of the Septuagint.

We have stated (p. 212) that traces of the Shemitic population introduced by the Hykshos, were long to be met with in the country round Tanis or Zoan. Brugsch (Hist. d'Egypte, p. 130) would locate another alien race round Heracleum on the western side of the Delta. There are grounds for believing that various bands of adventurers from the islands and the northern shores of the Mediterranean settled in Africa at a very early period. The Egyptians seem to have called them Tamahu, which Brugsch (Inschr. 2. 79) would render 'the Northerners.' One of their settlements seems to have been on the site of the future Alexandria. A certain inscription (Inschr. 1. 40) mentions a people called the Hā-neb-u, as living on the coast east of the Saitic nome at a place called Raketi. This Raketi, there can be little doubt, was the same place as the Rakōtis which in after ages flourished as a suburb of Alexandria. Brugsch supposes the Hā-neb-u to be the people inhabiting the Mediterranean districts (Inschr. 3. 57), but in the Ptolemaic and Roman times this term Ha-neb-u seems to have been used loosely to denote generally the Greek people. Perhaps it may have denoted originally a tribe of Tamahu, Shemitic or Indo-European, and the name may have remained fixed, though the population shifted. The settlement at Raketi must have been situated within or have neighboured upon the isle of Pharos, and in the Odyssey (4. 355) this island is described as a day's sail from Aiguptos, whence we may perhaps infer that when the Odyssey was written the branch of the Nile (Aiguptos) most frequented was computed to be a day's sail east of Pharos. With these foreign settlements on the coast the Egyptians were often at war, and the white men, who in certain pictures of the 18th dynasty are represented as undergoing the drudgery of the brick-yard (Leps. Denkm. 5. 40), may have been prisoners taken from these foreigners. There seems little doubt that

these settlements were formed by tribes of various origin, and that the names Tamahu, Ha-neb-u, &c., were terms used very indefinitely.

It is important to be able to fix the locality of any people mentioned in the inscriptions, and it is unfortunate that we can only loosely define the country of the Tahennu. They are generally represented with the southern flower[1] dependent from their necks, with yellow skin, short beard and side-locks, and with feathers on the head. According to Brugsch (Inschr. 2. 3) their name signifies the Westerns, and in some inscriptions it is written Tahennu-u (Inschr. 2. 78), whence it would appear that the name of the people was sometimes given to the country—Tahennu-u signifying the people of Tahennu. We can hardly err in supposing that the name Tahennu, or Westerns, was given to different tribes living west of Egypt, and more particularly to those bordering on the Lake Tritonis, and the Syrtes. The Mashawasha seem to have been neighbours to, but to have been looked upon as a people distinct from, the Tahennu.

The Mashawasha appear to have been for many centuries the dominant power in North Africa, west of the Syrtes. One of the islands in the lake Tritonis is said (Diod. Sic. 3. 53) to have been occupied by the Amazones, and we have concluded that the Amazones were the same people as the Mashawasha of the hieroglyphic inscriptions. We may, I think, assume that their ascendency was acquired later than the time of Moses. The only patriarch mentioned in the tenth chapter of Genesis who can be considered as representing this people is Madai, and we can hardly suppose that so slight a reference would have been thought sufficient for the ancestor of a people who had acquired the renown in Africa which the Persians had attained to. The

[1] It is not easy to define precisely what significance should be assigned to the use of the symbols, the northern and the southern flower. The northern flower generally indicates a people settled north of Egypt, but it seems in some cases to be appended to the neck of races who were northerners (tamahu) settled in North Africa. The southern flower *always*, I believe, indicates races settled south of Egypt, either in Africa or in Arabia.

Amazones or Mashawasha probably left Spain for Africa in the fourteenth century B.C. For the next seven or eight centuries they may be traced through mythus and legend till they emerge in the full blaze of history as lords of Asia. Among the more important events connected with their earlier history were the two invasions of Egypt, which made even the Pharaohs of the 19th and 20th dynasties tremble for their safety.

The invasions of Egypt by the 'peoples of the sea' could not be altogether ignored, even amid the indifference and ignorance which so long characterized historical research in Europe. But it is only recently that their bearing upon general history has been duly appreciated, and we are still waiting with more or less of impatience for the publication of documents that promise to bring into clearer relief some of their more interesting details. Among the various races which made up the confederacy—Turisha, Akaiusha, Kehak, Rebu, &c., Egyptologists seem to be gradually coming to the conclusion that we may recognize some of the more ancient of the Greek tribes, Dorians, Akhaioi, &c. The first invasion took place in the reign of Menephtha, son of Ramses II, and it is described in an inscription at Thebes, which was translated first by Dr. Birch and afterwards by De Rougé. The invaders ravaged a portion of the Delta, and penetrated to the very gates of Memphis. In his attempt to identify the names of the confederate races De Rougé stooped to a piece of ingenuity which might have been better spared. He compares Turisha with Dorieis, and Akaiosha with Akhaios. He must have known well that the final syllables of Dori-eis and Akhai-os were mere nominatival endings, and that consequently the close resemblance between the names he compares together was delusive. We may, I think, arrive at the same conclusion by a different and a safer method. I have elsewhere (p. 291) suggested, that the *sha* in Turisha, Akhaiusha, &c., may be a suffix, and on this supposition we may legitimately compare Turi-sha with Dori-eis. The earliest passage in

Greek literature which groups together these ancient tribes is the description of Crete in the Odyssey (19. 172)—

> 'Krētē is a certain land, in the midst of the dark sea,
> Beautiful and rich and sea-girt, and within it
> Are men many, without number—and cities ninety,
> But mixedly different the tongues of the different races—within it are Akhaioi,
> Within it the highminded Eteocrētes, and the Kudōnes,
> And the Dorieis thrice divided, and the divine Pelasgoi,
> In the midst of them is Knōssos that great city, where for nine years reigned
> Minōs, the bosom-friend of mighty Zeus,' &c.

The Eteocrētes and the Kudōnes are generally represented as among the earliest races in Crete. They were probably red men, and no doubt spoke a different language from the three Greek races, the Akhaioi, the Dorieis, and the Pelasgoi. Whether the poet intended to distinguish between the dialects of the Greek tribes may be doubted. Herodotus assigns a peculiar dialect to the Pelasgoi of certain districts, but this may be explained without assuming that the Pelasgoi generally were so distinguished. The question however which more particularly demands attention relates to the Dorians. Were this people settled in Crete *before* the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnesus?

According to the mythical history of Crete handed down to us by Diodorus (4. 60), Tectamus, son of Dorus, son of Hellen, son of Deucalion, sailed to Crete with Aioleis and Pelasgoi and reigned over it. He married the daughter of Krētheus and begat Asterios, in whose reign Zeus as they say carried off Europē from Phoinikē to Crete, and had by her three sons, Minōs, and Rhadamanthos, and Sarpedōn. Asterios afterwards married Europē, adopted her three sons, and dying left to them his kingdom. Diodorus elsewhere (5. 80) represents the Eteocretes as an aboriginal race in Crete; the Pelasgoi as the first, and the Dores under Tectamus as the second of the immigrant tribes. The followers of Tectamus came partly from the neighbourhood of Mount Olympus and partly from the Akhaioi of Laconia. This legend, as far as it goes, is, I believe, simple history;

and the mythus that preceded it also history with a thin veil of fable thrown over it. According to the mythus Greek immigrants were intermixed with the natives, personified by Krētheus, and afterwards subdued by the Phoenicians, personified by Minōs.

Staphylus, the historian of Thessaly, located the Dorians on the eastern, the Kudōnes on the western, and the Eteocretes on the southern side of the island (Str. 10. 4. 6). Strabo thought it probable that the Eteocretes and Kudōnes were native races, and the others strangers from Thessaly, as Andron described them to be. As regards the Kudōnes Strabo was probably mistaken, for there is reason to believe their settlement in the island was subsequent to some of the Greek settlements. Kudōnia, their capital, was said to have been built by Kudōn son of Tegeates, or, as the Cretans maintained, by Kudōn, grandson of Minōs (Paus. 8. 53. 4); whence we may gather that Arcadians from Tegea founded a town which was afterwards taken possession of by the Kudōnes, who from their connexion with Minōs must have been a Phoenician people. We have seen[1] that the men of Cuth or Cuthah, who were carried to Samaria, claimed kindred with the Sidonians, and that the latter were known by the same or similar names. The quince which, from growing wild in the district, was known as the Kudonian apple, is called in a fragment of Alcman Kodu-malon, or the apple of Kodu. It is not improbable that the first element of this compound, viz. Kodu, is the very same word as the scriptural name Cuthah.

The Scriptures mention a people called the Cherethim, and the Jews who wrote the Septuagint render the name by Krētes, i. e. Cretans. They appear to have dwelt in the south of Philistia in the neighbourhood of Gaza and Ascalon, i. e. in a district where, as I think we may gather from the hieroglyphic inscriptions, a people named the Shairetana dwelt. The Amalekites in the time of David made their inroad 'upon the south of the Cherethites, and

[1] Vide p. 152.

upon the coast which belongeth to Judah, and upon the south of Caleb' (1 Sam. 30. 14); and at a later period the Lord said by the mouth of Ezekiel (25. 16) 'I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims and destroy the remnant of the sea-coast'; and afterwards by the mouth of Zephaniah (2. 4) 'Gaza shall be forsaken and Ashkelon a desolation, they shall drive out Ashdod at the noonday, and Ekron shall be rooted up. Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea coast, the nation of the Cherethites,' &c. Ashkelon was the only one of the five Philistine towns which lay on the sea-coast, and according to Steph. Byz., Gaza was called Minoa, from Minos, and contained a temple of the Krētaian Zeus. I think, therefore, there are reasonable grounds for believing that the Cherethim were a Cretan colony settled in the district neighbouring upon Gaza and Ashkelon.

David's guard, as he fled from Jerusalem, consisted of Cherethites, Pelethites, and Gittites (2 Sam. 15. 18). The Gittites were the men of Gath, whom he had no doubt attached to his person when he sojourned in that city, and the Cherethites and Pelethites were, as we shall see reason to believe, races sent into Philistia by the Lydian king Akiamos. The Shairetana performed the same duties at the Egyptian court as the Cherethites at the court of David, and seem to have served as a kind of body-guard to the Pharaoh Ramses the Second. As such we find them taking part in the Egyptian campaigns, and even fighting against their own countrymen. The early history of Ascalon is surrounded with difficulties. It does not appear in the list of Philistine towns assigned to Judah (Josh. 15. 45, &c.), but in Judges 1. 18 we are told it was taken by that tribe. We might perhaps be tempted to infer that it did not exist when Joshua entered the promised land, but was built shortly afterwards. It seems to have thrown off its dependence at the same time as Gaza, Ekron, &c. (Judges 3. 3).

Stephanus Byzantinus (Askalōn) quotes Xanthus the Lydian historian, and Nicolas of Damascus, as his autho-

rities for certain particulars connected with the foundation of Askelon. We are told that Askalos and Tantalos were the sons of Humenaios, and that Askalos was sent with an army into Syria by Akiamos, king of the Ludoi, and, charmed with the place, abode there and founded Askelon. The name of Akiamos is not to be found in any list of Lydian kings that has come down to us, but the Lydian kings whose names are recorded in history were no doubt kings of Sardis, and there were Lydian tribes distinct from those of Sardis, e.g. the Toruboi, the Kiburatai, &c. According to Strabo (13. 4. 17) the Kiburatai were descended from the Ludoi, who got possession of Kabalis (Cabalia), and this event may have taken place when the Cretans, under Sarpedōn (whose grandson is said to have fought at Troy), vanquished the Solumoi. There were four languages spoken in Kibura, the speech of the Solumoi, the Pisidian, the Greek, and the Lydian; and Strabo tells us that in his time hardly a trace of the latter language was to be found in Lydia proper. Now Kibura was a town of great importance, and had several towns allied or subject to it. Somewhere to the south of it lay a town called Krētopolis, or the city of the Cretans, and at no great distance from Kibura, to the north, near the sources of the Maeander, lay the Phrygian town of Peltae. If then we suppose Akiamos to have been king of Kibura, and to have sent an expedition into Philistia and founded Askelon, we might account for the presence in that country of men from Kretopolis and Peltae. In Scripture we find the Cherethim and Pelethim coupled together, and the former apparently settled in the neighbourhood of Askelon, and as the Cherethim are called Cretans in the Septuagint, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the Cherethim and Pelethim were brought to Askelon by the Lydian king Akiamos.

During the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C. Askelon must have been a powerful state. According to Justin (18. 3) a king of Askelon attacked Sidon, and compelled the inhabitants to fly in their ships to Tyre, which they built the

year before the destruction of Troy[1]. The city built by the Sidonians must have been the insular Tyre, for Tyre on the mainland was of far more remote antiquity[2]. According to the generally received date of the capture of Troy, this conquest of Tyre by the men of Askelon must have taken place towards the close of the thirteenth century B.C., or shortly before the year 1200 B.C.

There is no real philological objection to our identifying the names Shairetana and Cherethim[3], and all we know of the history of the two races favour the conclusion that the Shairetana of the hieroglyphic inscriptions were the Cherethim of Scripture. On this supposition the Eteocretes, or native Cretans, must have been red men, for the Shairetana are represented as such in the Egyptian pictures. They carry a long, heavy, and pointed sword, and a round shield, and wear a helmet surmounted with a pair of horns and a round ball between them. This head-gear will, I think, admit of explanation.

Ashtoreth must have been worshipped in Palestine before the time of Abraham, for Chedorlaomer, when he advanced against the five kings, smote (Gen. 14. 5) the Rephaim in 'Ashteroth Karnaim,' the two-horned Ashtoreth[4] — evidently some temple dedicated to this goddess. The temple alluded to may have been swept away when the Israelites conquered Bashan (Josh. 12. 4), but the worship of the goddess prevailed long afterwards in the neighbouring districts. The oldest temple of the Celestial Venus known to Herodotus (1. 105) was at Askelon, and he tells us it

[1] 'Post multos deinde annos a rege Ascaloniorum expugnati, navibus appulsi Tyron, urbem ante annum Trojanae cladis condiderunt.' According to the Parian chronicle Troy was taken 1209 B.C.

[2] Vide p. 148.

[3] Brugsch and other Egyptologists suppose the Shairetana to represent the Sardinians. But the natives of Sardinia were called Sardi, and these critics have to explain how the name Shairetana can be derived from Sard. I should say that the *ana* of Shairetana is evidently the Egyptian rendering of the Shemitic plural-ending in Chereth-im.

[4] Some difficulty arises from the circumstance that the name Ashteroth takes the plural form. It was probably what is called a plural of dignity.

was certainly older than the one in Cyprus or that at Cythera. He tells us also that Venus was called Mylitta by the Assyrians, and by the Arabs Alitta (1. 131); and he elsewhere (3. 8) informs us that the Arabs living between Gaza and Egypt had for their only objects of worship Dionusos and the Heavenly Venus, whom they called Orotal and Alilat. Possibly the first syllable of Alilat may be El, the old Shemitic name for God, so that Al-ilat might mean the goddess Ilat or Alitta. It has been suggested that the Hebrew *yalad*, to gender or bring forth, was the root of Alitta. If so, the name and therefore the worship of this idol probably originated with the Shemitic races.

The Arabs who neighboured on the Cherethim had for their only objects of worship the Celestial Venus and Dionusos. The Celestial Venus must have been a varied form of Ashtoreth, who is generally supposed to represent the moon, and the horned Bacchus called Sabazios (Diod. 4. 4) or Sebadius, represented the sun (Macrob. Saturn. 1. 18). Hence we may conjecture that the horns and globes in the helmets of the Shairetana merely indicated that they were devotees of the two favourite idols worshipped in their neighbourhood.

The custom of exhibiting on their persons some symbol of their religious faith, makes the history of these early races, as it may be gathered from the Egyptian pictures, one of singular interest; and it is matter of surprise that these religious symbols have been so generally overlooked. We are told (Herod. 3. 8) that the people dwelling between Palestine and Egypt cut their hair in a round after the fashion of Dionusos, and this is the district which is generally represented as the birthplace of this god. The Sisoē—such is the name the Greeks gave to this mode of dressing the hair—is still followed by the Egyptian Moslem and called by them the Shusheh. It seems from the Egyptian pictures to have been widely prevalent among the races dwelling round Palestine, and the Israelites, as they were entering the promised land, were specially warned against it.

The tribes settled west of the Nile, such as the Tamahu, the Tahennu, &c., seem to have been all worshippers of the great goddess of Sais; in other words, of the Egyptian Neith, and the Greek Athēnē. In several Egyptian tombs we find four races depicted as entering Hades, and in the tomb of Seti I (Belzoni's tomb) these races are styled respectively the Tamahu, the Nahsi, the Amu, and the Ret. The last were the native Egyptians, the Amu the nomade tribes living east of Egypt, the Nahsi the blacks personified by an Ethiopian, and the Tamahu the whites settled on the coast west of the Nile. This last people have the symbol of the goddess Neith tattooed on the leg, and they have the mystical lock hanging from the right temple. What was the origin or meaning of the mystical lock has not yet been ascertained; but there can be little doubt that it had some reference to the worship of the Egyptian goddess of Sais.

There is another emblem often found in the Egyptian pictures, which is interesting as it seems to throw light on a difficult passage of Scripture. The people sometimes called the Pulusata or Philistines are often represented with a head-dress identical with that of the goddess Anuka. The Greek antiquaries who convert Isis into Juno generally make Anuka answer to Vesta, and it is said that there are Egyptian monuments of late date in which the two goddesses are identified. I suspect that the Anakim of Scripture were merely the members of a sect, which looked up to this goddess as their religious patroness, and that Hebron was the principal seat of her worship. In the time of Abraham her name seems to have been unknown there, at least is never mentioned in connexion with it, but the town afterwards built there was called Kiriath Arba, the city of Arba, 'which Arba was a great man among the Anakims;' Josh. 14. 15. I infer that after the time of Abraham Arba built a city at Hebron, and established there the worship of Anuka. When Caleb took the place, he drove thence Sheshai, and Ahiman, and Talmai, the children of

Anak (Josh. 15. 14), under which names it is generally supposed the writer wished to represent the three principal divisions of the Anakim. We are elsewhere told (Josh. 11. 21) that Joshua 'cut off the Anakims . . . from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, and from all the mountains of Judah, and from all the mountains of Israel; Joshua destroyed them utterly with their cities. There was none of the Anakims left in the land of the children of Israel: only in Gaza, in Gath, and in Ashdod there remained.' I would gather from these notices that at the time when Joshua invaded Palestine the whole population of the country from Hebron to the sea were Anakim or worshippers of Anuka, and that the Philistines still retained this worship after the Israelites were settled in Palestine. Why Askelon and Ekron do not appear as towns of the Anakim I cannot say. It may be that the singular devotion paid to Ashtoreth in the first of these towns may have prevented the worship of the rival goddess from penetrating into it. In one picture, representing an inroad made by the Egyptians into a Philistine district, a certain sea-faring people are represented as allies of the Philistines. Their galleys in all particulars resemble the Philistine, and their helmets resemble those of the Shairetana, save that there is no ball between the horns. May not these helmets indicate that the wearers were worshippers of Ashtoreth but not of Dionusos? and, if so, may they not be the Phoenicians of Cyprus? We know that Ashtoreth was worshipped with singular honour in that island, but I do not recollect any passage which represents the worship of Dionusos as established there.

At the Grecian Thebes there was a gate called the Ogygian, which it was generally supposed was named after the ancient people who founded the city. There was also an Onkian gate, which, according to Stephanus Byzantinus (Ogkaiai), obtained its name from a neighbouring temple, dedicated to the goddess Onka, who was of course the 'Queen Onka' of Aeschylus (Sept. contra Theb. 164). Hesychius (ogkas) considers these to be different appellations of

the same gate. When we find the name of Onka thus brought into connexion with the term Ogygian we can hardly fail to be reminded of Hebron, which so long retained the names of Anuka and Ogyges (page 243) among its most cherished memories. It is probable that some of the adventurers who settled at Thebes came from southern Palestine.

Among the floating populations of the Mediterranean there seems to have been a general aptitude for combining towards some common object. The custom of lending themselves out as mercenaries was widely prevalent among them, and the habits thus engendered would induce them to join any expedition which promised to be a profitable adventure. If eminent success was achieved, the results might for a greater or shorter period leave a mark behind them, and to some such chance confederacy may perhaps be ascribed the rise of certain monarchies which appear in history as meteors, and sometimes depart as quickly. The pressure also which the older monarchies exerted upon their neighbours led to frequent displacements of peoples; and there can be little doubt that the islands of the Mediterranean and the sea coasts of Asia furnished refuges to many a people flying from the armies of Egypt long before the Phoenicians had made themselves felt in Europe. One of these emigrations was made the subject of a well-known mythus by Apollodorus.

According to this mythologist (2. 1. 4) Danaos was a son of Belus and grandson of Poseidōn and Libya. To escape the machinations of his brother Aiguptos he fled and took refuge at Argos. Akrisios, king of Argos, is generally represented as his grandson, and

> 'Danaē, the elegant-footed daughter of Akrisios,
> Who Perseus bore, the most renowned of all men' (*Il.* 14. 319),

his descendant in the fourth degree (Apollod. 2. 2. 1). Homer (Il. 19. 123) makes Eurystheus, king of Argos, a descendant of Perseus, and Herodotus (2. 91) derives Danaos from that ancient city in the Thebaid called Chemmis, where Perseus

had a temple. He elsewhere tells us (6. 53) that the kings of Argos were Greeks till the time of Perseus, who was of Egyptian descent. The mythus thus detailed might admit of the explanation that certain of the Tahenn-u or Dana-oi yielded to the attacks of Egypt and fled to Argos, accompanied by their neighbours, the Mashawasha or Persae. But the legends that circulated among the Persians presented the story in a somewhat different shape. The Persians (Herod. 6. 54) represented Perseus as an Assyrian, and the ancestors of Akrisios as Egyptians. From the Persian legend we might infer that certain emigrants from Tahennu fled to Argos to escape Egyptian tyranny, and that a body of Persians succeeded, and perhaps supplanted, them as the ruling power in that city. As the earliest Persians in Asia were Assyrian subjects, we can understand how the Persians came to give the title of Assyrians to these their own remote ancestors, who settled in Argos. The political relations that existed between the ruling families of Thebes and Argos are involved in obscurity. Were they better understood they might possibly throw some light on that mysterious event, the return of the Heracleidae.

Several circumstances lead us to infer that the worship of the goddess Athēnē came into Greece not directly from Sais, but through the medium of her worshippers on the lake Tritonis. Homer calls her Tritogeneia (Il. 4. 515); and Herodotus (4. 180) tells us that she was said to be the daughter of Poseidōn and the lake Tritonis. The same historian informs us (4. 189), that her celebrated *aegis* was borrowed from the goatskin tunic worn by the Libyan women, the surrounding fringe of hair being converted into snakes, the better to suit the purposes of Greek fable.

We have assumed that it was Egyptian hostility that checked the development of the Persian power in Africa. But it is probable that it suffered less from the Egyptians than from the steady growth of the Phoenician settlements

on the coast. Before the quiet perseverance of the trader the desultory efforts of these tribes must have lost their importance. Their military services were at the command of those who could pay for them, Egyptians, Phoenicians, &c. The Mashawasha formed an important part of the Egyptian armies from the eighth to the sixth century B.C., and of the garrison of Tyre (Paras) in the fifth and sixth (Ezek. 27. 10). The Persae, indeed, at this time were little better than a race of military adventurers.

Several mythi connect them with Colchis. According to Diodorus (4.45) Aietes, king of Colchis, married the daughter of Perses, king of Taurica, and had by her Kirke and Medeia. He was afterwards dethroned by Perses, but restored by Medus, son of Medeia (4. 56). These fables are useful as pointing out the route by which the Persians and the connected races may have gained access to the countries which afterwards bore their names. In the ninth century B.C. they were settled east of Mount Zagros, and recognized as a dominant tribe among the Arioi. But these questions carry us too far from the west of Europe, and intrude upon the domain of the Assyriologist. When history begins to dawn, it may be well for the speculator to keep silence.

Connected with the history of the Medes and Persians is that of another people, whose name and nationality still survive; though the reader may have some difficulty in recognizing the Armenians under their native name of Haic.

The histories of Armenia are all founded on that of Moses of Chorene. This historian derived the Armenians from Haic, son of Togarmah, and with the usual licence of mythology assigned him various sons, each symbolizing an Armenian district. Haic is now, and appears to have been from the earliest period, the national name of the people. The monkish historian no doubt got from Herodotus (7. 73) the information that the Armenians were colonists of the Phruges, and from Josephus (Ant. 1. 6. 1) that the Phruges were descended from Togarmah. This would

account for the introduction of Togarmah's name into the mythus, but will not explain why the Armenian patriarch was called Haic. When the confederation in Spain was broken up, Sallust tells us (vide p. 289) that the Persae went to Africa, and the Medi and Armeni to Libya, i.e. to the district lying between Egypt and the Syrtes. Now among the races called the 'peoples of the sea,' who twice invaded Egypt, we find a people called the Kehak mixed up with the Mashawasha, Turisha, &c. May not these Kehak be the Armeni of Sallust and the Haic of the modern Armenians?

When the Medes and Persians left Africa for Asia it is probable that their neighbours, the Kehak, also yielded to the pressure of the Phoenician settlements and migrated likewise; and as the Medes and Persians conquered the Arioi and established their respective nationalities on that of the conquered people, so the Kehak may have conquered and coalesced with the surrounding tribes, and so have given the name of Haic to modern Armenia. Their nationality must have early taken deep root, for it survived the changes that followed the conquests of Alexander. Strabo tells us (11. 14. 5) that on the death of Antiochus the Great the governors of Sophēnē and other adjacent districts declared their independence, whence it came to pass that the men of those countries all spoke the same language. That language must have been the Armenian, and we may infer that the men who spoke it were for the most part descendants of Ashkenaz, for Josephus[1] evidently alludes to the 'Askhanaxoi' as to an extant people well known in his day, and I know of no people but the Armenians that could answer to these requirements. Ashkenaz was the name of one of the three northern kingdoms that brought their cavalry against Babylon (Jer. 51. 27). Babylon fell 538 B.C., and as Herodotus, who flourished a century later, speaks (7. 73) of the 'Armenioi' as an established nationality, it is probable that it was in the interval

[1] See above, p. 24.

that the Armenioi gained their ascendency. After the death of Antiochus had weakened the power of Syria, the neighbouring races seem to have been brought into closer union by the sympathies of a common language, and to have been called indifferently Armenioi or Askhanaxoi.

According to the traditions of Sais,[1] the domination of a great African power preceded Greek adventure in the west of Europe. Ancient legends relative to events of such remote antiquity are few and necessarily vague, but such as they are they confirm the accounts which Solon received from the Egyptian priests. Avienus, who had consulted the Carthaginian Annals (Ora Mar. 414), tells us that many writers asserted that Tartessus and its neighbourhood was at one time an African district (Ib. 332). In support of this view he quotes the elder Dionysius, who is so often referred to as an authority in matters of this kind:—

> 'Sacrum superbas erigit cautes jugum—
> Locum hunc vocavit Herma quondam Graecia.
> Est Herma porro cespitum munitio
> Interfluum quae altrinsecus munit lacum.
> Aliique rursus Herculis dicunt Viam,
> Stravisse quippe maria fertur Hercules,
> Iter ut pateret facile captivo gregi;
> Porro illud Herma jure sub Libyci soli
> Fuisse pridem plurimi autores ferunt.
> Nec respuendus testis est Dionysius,
> Libyae esse finem qui docet Tartessium.'

Pausanias tells us (10. 17. 2) that the Libues were the first settlers in Sardinia, and that they came under the conduct of Sardus, son of Maceris, who among the Egyptians and Libues was called Heraklēs. The ancient Sards were probably a Berber race and a red people; and perhaps we may be justified in saying as much of the Eteocretes, who appear to have been the earliest inhabitants of Crete. The other ancient race of Crete, alien to the Greeks, were the Kūdones, and these I believe to have been connected with the Eruthraioi of the Greeks, and to represent the people called in Scripture Cuth and Cuthah. The Berber

[1] See above, p. 282.

nationality in Africa seems to have sunk beneath the ascendency of the white races, who settled in that country after the disruption of the confederacy in Spain. If, as I have concluded, the Berbers were represented by the Kufa of the hieroglyphic inscriptions, they must have early attained a high degree of civilization, and we may feel the less inclined to quarrel with the accounts that have been handed down to us of the great power and influence they once exercised in western Europe.

The Greek confederacy and the events it gave rise to must have more or less affected the fortunes of western Europe. Its details can be only dimly traced, but I cannot doubt that we have a real event and not a mere phantom before us; and to ignore the records of the past, because they have come down to us wrapped up in mythus and fable, seems to me to exhibit much more of 'philosophy' than of wisdom. One of the main defects of historical research in modern times has been the feeble attempts that have been made to carry it out continuously. The civilization of a particular epoch cannot be duly appreciated, unless we have some acquaintance with the civilization that preceded it. It is a delicate task to piece together the scattered shreds of information that have come down to us, so disjointed are the statements, and so various the degree of credit that may be due to them; but we should at least make an attempt to do so, and, even if it be a failure, it may not be without its value. Materials for founding right conclusions are accumulating daily; and the foregoing speculations will not be altogether worthless, if their only result be to direct the attention of scholars to points of difficulty, which at the present time seem more particularly to require their notice.

CHAPTER X.

Early biblical Chronology. — Nature of Inspiration. Our knowledge of early chronology rests mainly on two dates, that of the call of Abraham and that of the Exodus; the genuineness of 1 Kings 6. 1 and of Gen. 15. 13 considered; St. Paul's statement Gal. 3. 17, reconciled; account of Moses' parentage Ex. 6. 20, not inconsistent with the 400 years of sojourn in Egypt; the 450 years ascribed to the period of the Judges explained. Dr. Hales on the longer scheme of chronology; Mr. Stuart Poole's ingenious attempt to support it. — Difficulty of fixing the *actual* date of any event in early history; Zoan built seven years after Hebron, which was probably built not long before Sarah's death, and according to the calculation of Josephus about 2200 years B.C.; Abraham went to Egypt before the Hykshos invasion; during his sojourn in Canaan, the Elamites were dominant on the Euphrates; according to an Assyrian inscription they were pursuing their conquests on the Euphrates in the 23rd century B. C. — The supremacy of the Elamites probably followed by that of the southern Chaldees or the Nahorites shortly before the year 2000 B. C.; by that of the Kassi or Kossaioi a few centuries later, and lastly by that of the Assyrians. — The Kassi the same people as the Kossaioi of the classical geographers and the Cush mentioned in the description of Eden, Gen. 2. 13; the dynasties of Berosus.

The three languages used in the Achaemenian inscriptions probably those of the three great dominant races, viz. the Medes and Persians, the Assyrians, and the Kassi or Kossaioi. — Origin of the two ancient races the Accadi and Sommari unknown; the phrase 'the four languages' equally ancient, and its meaning also unknown.

In the preceding speculations we have touched very lightly on the subject of chronology. It is one of acknowledged difficulty, and may excuse some little hesitation on our part in dealing with it. But we can hardly hope to bring the scattered fragments of history into order without its aid, and when we cannot obtain all we want, we may act not unwisely in accepting what is within our reach. Scripture and the Egyptian monuments are our only trustworthy guides for the earlier periods. The monuments sometimes throw an astonishing light upon certain portions

of Egyptian history, but it is fitful and partial, and we are again thrown back upon doubt and speculation; and, though Scripture affords us a steadier and more continuous light, yet the frequent mishaps we witness in others may teach us how many are the pitfalls that beset our footsteps even in this direction.

One of the difficulties that accompany Scriptural statement is supposed to arise from its 'inspiration.' To attempt to define *generally* how the mind of Deity acts upon and controls the mind of man, would be little better than an act of folly, but there are passages in Scripture which seem in special cases to define that action, and by studying them I think we may gain a clearer insight into the mode in which it sometimes pleases the Maker to communicate his will to his creatures. The extraordinary seem to differ from the ordinary revelations of that will in degree rather than in kind.

Our Lord promised his disciples that the Spirit should bring to their remembrance all that he had said unto them (John 14. 26). It is a well-known fact that matters, which appear to have entirely faded from the memory, may by some accident be brought back with all the vividness of first impressions. The three 'synoptic' gospels sometimes record the sayings of our Lord and others, partly with identity of phrase and partly with variations that are more or less important. By way of explanation, it has been suggested that there may have been an earlier gospel, written or oral, which was known to all the evangelists and used by them as their purposes required; while others suppose that there were never more than the extant gospels, the three synoptists copying and supplementing one another, though it has never been settled which was the original and which the copy. For my own part I believe each evangelist recorded his own experiences. The events he describes were as distinctly before his mind when he wrote, as when he saw them occur or heard them narrated; but some minds are more appreciative of circumstances than others, and

hence some of the accounts are more full and circumstantial than others, or throw into more marked relief particular parts of the same transaction.

In estimating the real nature of these utterances, we must not forget the channel through which they have come down to us. Great care is sometimes necessary in assigning them their proper character. The speech of Stephen (Acts 7) attests its own genuineness, which has been acknowledged even by those who are not friendly to Christianity. We may assume that St. Luke did not hear the speech, but the great Apostle he followed must have drunk in every word, and *his* was doubtless the report of it, which has come down to us. What then must we say to the account of Abraham's purchase of the sepulchre at Sychem? I would answer it was a blunder on the part of Stephen—one of those blunders which were not unlikely to occur among the Jews of the Dispersion, when interpreting or repeating Scripture; and that the ignorance of the youthful Hellenist was recorded in the same spirit of fearless honesty, as was shown in describing the meannesses of Jacob or the crimes of David. In this, as in similar cases, we have a truthful narrative before us, but we must not expect to find in it more than it professes to give or we can reasonably expect to find in it.

The language of the older Scriptures exhibits peculiarities which require to be no less carefully kept in mind. Instead of that precision of speech which modern writers aim at, we often meet with that vagueness of speech which characterizes popular language, and which, though sufficiently definite for its purpose at the time it was used, has in later times misled some very able commentators. In describing the Anakim slain by David and his servants, one of them is said to be the son, not of a particular giant, but generally 'son of the giant' (1 Chron. 20. 6). In this case the looseness of phrase can hardly mislead any reader of ordinary intelligence, but in describing the pedigree of David a similar kind of phrase has been productive of serious error.

Salmon we are told (Matt. 1. 5) begat Booz of Rachab, and consequently that not much more than a century could have elapsed between the birth of Rahab's child and the birth of David—a conclusion which shows us there must be a mistake somewhere. It is not far to seek. Rahab founded a family in Israel (Josh. 6. 25), and there can be little doubt, as has been suggested by more than one commentator, that this family is referred to as 'the children of Jericho' in Ezra 2. 34, and in Nehem. 3. 2. If Salmon married a member of this family he might, in popular phraseology—which seems to have been particularly affected in matters of this kind—be said to have married Rahab, though possibly the only connexion between them may have been collateral, for Rahab brought with her her father's house when she joined Israel. Another specimen of this loose phraseology occurs in the pedigree of Moses. According to Exodus 6. 20, Amram, the father of Moses, 'took him Jochebed his father's sister to wife, and she bare him Aaron and Moses;' and according to Numbers 26. 59 Jochebed was born 'to Levi in Egypt.' Now whatever possible length of time we assign to Levi in Egypt (Exodus 6. 16) Jochebed must, on the assumption before us, have been two or three hundred years old at the time Moses was born, which was some eighty years before the Exodus, for otherwise we should not be able to make up the 400 years required for the sojourn in Egypt (Gen. 15. 13). The truth is, we are dealing with a mistranslation. Instead of 'Jochebed his father's sister,' the Septuagint has 'Jochebed the daughter of his father's brother.' *Dowd* and *dowdah* mean commonly uncle and aunt, but they primarily signify a loved one, a friend, and they take a wide range of secondary meanings. In the Canticles *dowd* is rendered 'my beloved,' and in Jeremiah 32. 12 it signifies not an uncle, but an uncle's son. We can therefore have no difficulty in giving to the feminine form *dowd-ah* the meaning the writers of the Septuagint gave it, viz. an uncle's daughter. The difficulties which surround the text in Num. 26. 59 may be explained by considering it as

a specimen of the loose phraseology of which we have been speaking. The statement that her mother bare Jochebed to Levi in Egypt, may mean simply that she bare her to Levi, not in the character of her husband, but merely as the head of the family with which she had connected herself.

Dr. Mill has shown how little we can trust the genealogies, as a groundwork for chronological purposes. The Jews and other Shemitic races in compiling their genealogies seem occasionally to have followed principles, which are now not very intelligible. We may understand why Jehu should be called the son of Nimshi, who was really his grandfather, but are startled when in an Assyrian inscription we find him called the son of Omri, who was merely his predecessor on the throne of Israel, and with whom he does not appear to have had any blood-connexion. The two pedigrees of our Saviour (Matt. 1. 1–16, Luke 3. 23) have been explained, and I think happily explained, by the present Bishop of Bath and Wells. He thinks the first line through Solomon was a mere regnal list, and that the second through Nathan gave the real or blood descent from David. Attempts more or less successful have been made to explain other genealogical difficulties that occur in Scripture, but to make them intelligible we must enter into detail, and space is wanting for the purpose.

In treating of such a subject as the present one, we can hardly help asking ourselves, can we trust the genuineness of the text? The circumstances of its history are, I think, sufficient to secure our confidence. The Jew showed his jealousy for the purity of the text by the watch he kept over the Targumist. When the latter translated from the ancient Hebrew into the popular Aramaic, for the benefit of the people, he was forbidden to write down his interpretation,[1] lest in time it might be confounded with the text

[1] The oldest Targum that has come down to us, is generally supposed to have been committed to writing about the time of our Saviour. The Septuagint has been called a Targum, but it differs in so many particulars from the Jewish Targums, that it may be best to look upon it as a work apart.

it illustrated. It was a Jewish belief that Ezra revised and annotated the Bible, and there are passages that bear out the tradition. The liberty that was sternly denied to others may have been granted to a man so eminent, for the authority of such an editor was almost equal to that of the original writer. On the whole the result is a text of singular purity. Few works have been subjected to such searching criticism—criticism which has been often captious and hostile, and we might almost say malignant, and no work has vindicated its genuineness more triumphantly. Still, however, every MS. that deals with numbers must be more or less liable to error, and we ought therefore in any chronological inquiry to be on our guard against it.

Our knowledge of early chronology, as it may be gathered from the Bible, rests mainly on two dates, the date of the Exodus, and that of the call of Abraham; and the texts which bear most directly upon these questions are 1 Kings 6. 1, and Genesis 15. 13. The information which has been gradually accumulated on the subject seems to weigh strongly in favour of the genuineness of the texts, and the statements in Scripture apparently inconsistent with them admit of a reasonable explanation. Assuming the two texts to be trustworthy, we can readily calculate the interval that elapsed between the building of the temple and the date when Abraham first entered Canaan. Chronologists differ as to the precise year when the building of the temple began. We will select 1010 B.C. as the date lying about midway between the two extreme dates assigned to it.

Building of the Temple begun	1010 B.C.
Years elapsed since the Exodus (1 Kings 6. 1)	480
Years of the sojourn in Egypt (Gen. 15. 13)	400
Years from Abraham's arrival in Canaan till Jacob's descent into Egypt	215 [1]

[1] Abraham was 100 years old at Isaac's birth, Isaac 60 at the birth of Jacob and Esau; and Jacob 130 when he went down into Egypt. This event therefore must have taken place 290 years after Abraham's birth, and 215 after his call, for Abraham was 75 years old when he passed over into Canaan.

According to this calculation the Exodus took place 1490 B.C. and Abraham entered Canaan 2105 B.C.

What were the results of antediluvian thought and speculation are not, I think, a hopeless subject of inquiry; every year is throwing fresh light upon the subject. The most ancient known dialect of Babylonia, the Accadian, as Dr. Hincks has termed it, and those extraordinary relics the Books of the Dead, of which Egypt has preserved so many exemplars, must furnish pregnant hints in following out the investigation. The mysterious fragments which have been handed down to us in Scripture were doubtless permitted to reach us for a purpose; and I believe, before many generations have passed by, we shall be discussing the nature not only of the antediluvian language, but of the beliefs which then governed mankind, and led them on to evil or to good. May those who venture on these slippery paths have wisdom given them to direct their steps aright!

Berosus left an account of a deluge which, in several particulars, resembled the account in Genesis; and Mr. George Smith discovered another such account on an Assyrian tablet that must be as old as the seventh century B.C., and purports to be a copy of one which Mr. Smith, for reasons assigned, believes to have been 1000 years older. A mysterious personage named Hasisadra,[1] who seems to have been consulted as a kind of prophet, tells the story, according to which he entered into a ship, accompanied by his dependents, male and female, and by the beasts of the field, and closed the door; then came tempest, rain, and flood, and all things living on the earth perished; the ship after certain days grounded on a mountain, and a dove, a swallow, and a raven were sent out, the two former returning, and the last returning not; and all this destruction was brought to pass owing to the wicked-

[1] Xisuthros, the name found in Berosus, was evidently a corruption of this name Hasisadra. It seems to have been long kept afloat in eastern tradition.

ness of mankind. It is clear that in the plains of the Euphrates there must have lingered traditions of the deluge, and that they strongly resembled the account which Moses has transmitted to us. We need not, therefore, be surprised that the destruction of the Great Tower had not entirely faded from the recollection of those who dwelt in the same neighbourhood.[1]

But the message has been misconstrued in the majority of cases, owing rather to the ignorance or carelessness of the recipient than to any failure in the channel through which it has come down to him. When we read Scripture, we often forget that we are reading the works of men who have been taught to look on things around them from a point of view very different from our own. Instead of putting ourselves in their place, we endeavour to wrest their utterances to suit our own views of their propriety, and cannot be surprised to find them unmeaning or discordant. Before we can understand a message delivered to us, we must have acquainted ourselves with the language in which it is conveyed, and with the circumstances which, in any particular case, modify that language.

It has been urged as an objection to the genuineness of 1 Kings 6. 1 that the custom of dating from an aera did not prevail till a later period. This is not the fact. The Egyptians did so reckon, as we know from an inscription found at Zoan, which refers to the introduction of the worship of Sutekh. The Exodus was just such an event as we might expect the Jews to date from. Again we are told that Origen, when (John 2. 20) he refers to 1 Kings 6. 1, says nothing about the 480 years; but to suppose that the 480 years is, therefore, an interpolation, is unsafe criticism, inasmuch as in the Septuagint we find a definite number of years specified (440), which does not greatly differ from that in the Hebrew. The *real* objection to the text was no doubt the difficulties supposed to be connected

[1] Smith, Chaldean Account of Genesis, pp. 256 sqq.

with its chronology. One set of objectors considers the 480 years too short a period to meet the circumstances of the case, and another set regards them as too long a period. We will for the present examine the arguments of those who maintain that the period is too short.

I do not discuss the chronological data which occur in the book of Judges. Othniel's history—the eighty years of Ehud's judgeship, &c.—are beset with difficulties; and when so many of the details are the subject of doubt, the sum total, which is found by adding the several numbers together, can hardly fail to be misleading. But there was one attempt made to support a chronology longer than is sanctioned by the 480 years of 1 Kings 6. 1, which should not pass unnoticed, if it be merely on account of its extreme ingenuity.

The objection generally takes the following shape:—If we allow forty years for the Wandering in the Wilderness, 300 for the interval between Moses and Jephthah (Judges 11. 26), thirty years for the government of Jephthah and his three successors (Judges 12. 7, &c.), and eighty years for the reigns of Saul and David, there remain of the 480 years only thirty for the governments of Samson, Eli, and Samuel. But we must remember that the 300 years Jephthah spoke of was evidently a round number, used by a rude unlettered man under circumstances that almost invited exaggeration. Had the real time come near to 270 years, Jephthah might and probably would have called it 300 years. It would thus be quite possible to make up sixty years or more for the reigns of the last three Judges, and the three governments might be included within some such period, on more than one reasonable hypothesis. Let us now turn to the consideration of the text, Exodus 12. 40.

In Exodus 12. 40 it is distinctly stated that the length of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt was 430 years, and this statement is made not incidentally but formally, not *in re* but *in rem*. To reconcile these 430 years with the 400 years of Gen. 15. 13, it has been supposed that the latter

was used as a mere round number. I would take a somewhat different view of the matter. Joseph came into Egypt about twenty-three years before Jacob, and it is impossible to read the narrative without seeing how entirely it follows the fortunes of Joseph. Moses seems to have considered the history of the Israelites at that time as bound up in the history of the injured brother; and it is probable that the 430 years was the actual time that had elapsed since the arrival of Joseph in Egypt, and 407, or, in round numbers, 400 years, the time that had elapsed since the descent of Jacob. This view is confirmed by what appears to be a critical emendation of the text introduced into the Septuagint. In that version the passage reads thus: 'The sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and *in the land of Canaan*, was 430 years;' whence it would appear that the writer considered the twenty-three years passed in Canaan, between the abduction of Joseph and the descent of Jacob, to be included in the 430 years. The period of 400 years is in agreement with the promise made to Abraham that his seed should return to Canaan in the fourth generation[1] (Gen. 15. 16).

The Egyptians had a vague year, consisting of twelve months, each of thirty days, and of five days additional, making altogether 365 days. As the fractional day was neglected it is obvious that the commencement of this year must in process of time have passed through all the seasons. Mr. R. Stuart Poole started the hypothesis that this vague year was the one in use among the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt, and that the vague year current at the time of the Exodus was fixed by the ordinance of Moses (Exod. 12. 2), and became thenceforwards

[1] From the ages of Jacob, Joseph, Kohath, Amram, &c., it would seem that the average length of life immediately before the Exodus was above 100 years. After the Exodus it seems to have sunk to the seventy years now allotted to man. Egyptologists have given reasons for believing that in ancient Egypt the average length of life before the time of the Exodus agreed with that which was assigned to man in the early Scriptures.

the year of the Israelites. The civil year of the Israelites began at the new moon nearest the autumnal equinox, but for sacred purposes the year began at the new moon nearest the vernal equinox. In the year 1648 B.C., which Dr. Hales' chronology assigns to the Exodus, the vague year of the Egyptians began on or about the autumnal equinox, and in the year 1652 B.C. there was a full moon on the fourteenth of the Egyptian month Phamenoth. Mr. Poole considers this day to be the same as the fourteenth of the month Abib (Exod. 12. 18). If the calculations he relies on be correct, and the data on which they rest trustworthy, these coincidences are certainly very remarkable. Experience however has made me suspicious of conclusions depending on any nice adjustments of numerical values, but, though I hesitate to adopt it, I frankly own I do not think Mr. Poole's speculation has met with the attention it deserves.[1]

A bishop of our church has been led to the conclusion that the 480 years of 1 Kings 6 is *too long* a period for the time that elapsed between the Exodus and the temple-building. His arguments mainly rest on the shortness of David's pedigree. He tells us that David's genealogy is in agreement with no less than eight others, which span the same period. Of these genealogies two give us fifteen generations, five fourteen, and one, like David's own genealogy, eleven generations. That is, counting three generations to a century, two of these genealogies allow five centuries from the time of the patriarchs, five make the interval somewhat less than five, and one of the genealogies, like David's, furnishes us with an interval of about four centuries. These results certainly bring the Bible chronology more nearly into agreement with the hypothesis which makes one of the Pharaohs of the nineteenth dynasty the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But at what a price is the agreement purchased! We must give up not only the 480 years

[1] Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, *s. v.* Year: Vol. iii. 1804.

of 1 Kings 6, and the long interval alluded to by Jephthah (Judg. 11. 26), but even the 430 years of the sojourn in Egypt. I cannot bring myself to make these sacrifices, but when we find a writer, whose speculations are generally so cautious and reverent, willing to make them, we see how strongly some minds are impressed with the necessity of identifying the Ramses referred to in Exodus with one of the Pharaohs of the nineteenth dynasty. This line of princes certainly delighted in the name of Ramses, and they as certainly took an interest in the great cities of their eastern frontier, as is attested by extant monuments. The identification of the scriptural Pharaoh with one of these princes naturally suggests itself; but the more we consider it, the more serious appear the difficulties that surround the hypothesis. These difficulties may be avoided, as we have already suggested[1], by supposing the name of Rames, son of Ahmes the first Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty, to be merely another form of Ramses. I do not profess to be an Egyptologist, and therefore may be thought presumptuous in offering an opinion on such a subject, but I may be allowed to say thus much—that as far as my lights extend, I see no insuperable objection in the way of considering Rames and Ramses as merely variant forms of the same name.

There are other difficulties which may present themselves to the reader's mind in these inquiries, and which demand notice. In Galatians 3. 17 St. Paul apparently counts the 430 years from the time of the promise made to Abraham, and there are chronologists who make the 430 years the measure of the interval between the Promise and the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. The passage however admits of a construction which is not repugnant to the conclusions we have arrived at. It was sufficient for St. Paul's reasoning that there was a considerable interval between the Covenant and the Law, and the exact length of the interval was immaterial. He seems therefore to have seized upon

[1] See above, p. 210.

the 430 years as a well-known portion of the interval, and said in effect—the covenant which was confirmed by God in Christ, the Law which must have been given, as you all know, at the least 430 years afterwards, cannot disannul. The mind of the Apostle was too much absorbed in the great theme before him to stoop to the discussion of chronological niceties.

Again, according to our Authorized Version, Acts 13. 20 assigns a period of 450 years to the government of the Judges, which would introduce a disturbing element into our calculations. There is reason to believe that our Authorized Version has here followed a blundered text. It is a rendering opposed to the translation of Jerome and to all the early MSS., the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and the Sinaitic. Before such a weight of authority the received text must, I think, give way, and Alford himself would probably have yielded, if he had seen the Sinaitic MS. when he wrote his criticism. According to these ancient MSS. the rendering should be, 'The God of the people of Israel chose our fathers and exalted the people, when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, &c.—and about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness, and when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot—in about 450 years—and *after these things* he gave them judges,' &c., so that the 450 years instead of being the period of the Judges, measures the interval between the descent of Jacob into Egypt and the partition of the land. We do not know precisely the date of the partition, but Caleb obtained his inheritance forty-five years after the Exodus (Josh. 14. 10), and adding the time of the sojourn in Egypt we get 445 years, which approaches near enough to the 450 years of St. Paul.

If we could fix the *actual* date of some event in the early history of Egypt, it might serve as a corrective of these speculations. Unfortunately our knowledge of that history is barely sufficient to show us the *relative* dates. Not many years back a discovery was made which promised a satis-

factory solution of the difficulty, and is still looked upon by many as having solved it. At Elephantine are the ruins of a temple built by Thothmes III; and in the ruins was found a stone, and on it an inscription referring to a certain heliacal rising of the dog-star, which according to calculation must have taken place in the year 1445 B.C. If we suppose that this inscription was made when the temple was built and in the latter part of Thothmes' reign, then, supposing Thothmes II to have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, that event may well have taken place some time in the early half of the fourteenth century B.C. It is true that the stone containing the inscription was not found *in situ*, and that the inscription may refer to some event that took place after the temple was built, but the more natural supposition is that it referred to the erection of the temple, and it is not an unfair presumption that at least one point in the reign of Thothmes III is thus fixed chronologically.

How little the Jewish genealogies can be depended on in these calculations has been amply shown by Dr. Mill. The officials who compiled them seem to have omitted links in a pedigree, sometimes, as in the pedigree in Matthew, merely for the sake of symmetry, and sometimes for other purposes which appear to be quite as immaterial. Stress has been laid on the fact that we have four pedigrees of David, all in substantial agreement with each other. But I must own I incline to the opinion that the pedigree in Ruth 4 (from *v.* 18 to *v.* 22) was merely an addition made when Ezra settled the Canon, and that in its present shape it cannot claim a higher antiquity than the pedigrees in 1 Chron. 2. 50 and the Gospels; in other words, than about the time of the Captivity. The fact seems to be that all the leading families at Bethlehem claimed Salmon as their patriarch (1 Chron. 2. 54), but that while the genealogist followed in Ruth 4. 20 made Salmon a descendant of Nahshon 'captain of the children of Judah' (Numb. 2. 3), the genealogist referred to in Chronicles made him a descendant of Caleb. These differences of statement I cannot explain

Little attention has been hitherto directed to these questions, and the principles they involve have been little studied. We can understand how Jehu son of Jehoshaphat came to be called the son of Nimshi, but are startled when in an Assyrian inscription we find him termed son of Omri. The Assyrians did not hesitate in connecting him with one of the more conspicuous of his later predecessors on the throne of Israel, though there was no blood relationship between them.[1]

The dates assigned to the foundation of cities are, I think, more trustworthy than they are generally taken to be, and there is one such date which is especially significant as regards our present subject. There is a remarkable passage in Numbers 13. 22, which states that Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt. The great antiquity of Hebron seems to have passed into a proverb. According to Josephus (Bell. Jud. 4. 9. 7) it was said to be 2300 years old, and more ancient than Memphis. The latter statement was evidently a blundered legend founded on the passage quoted from Numbers; and interpreted thereby it can only mean that Hebron was more ancient than Zoan. As Josephus flourished in the first century, this legend would fix the building of Zoan to about the twenty-second century B.C. Now Sarah was sixty-five years old when she first came into Canaan, Abraham being at that time seventy-five years old (Gen. 12. 4), and she ten years younger than her husband (Gen. 17. 17), and Sarah died in Kiriath Arba, that is Hebron (Gen. 23. 2), at the age of 127 (Gen. 23. 1). Before this mention of Kiriath Arba, i.e. the city of Arba, we hear of no town at Hebron during Abraham's sojourn in that neighbourhood. The three Amorites, Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner, who were confederate with Abraham (Gen. 14. 13), seem to have been, like Abraham, mere nomads dwelling among their flocks and herds. They must have occupied the country immediately round Hebron, for it bore their names in after ages—

[1] Cf. p. 317 above.

the oaks of Mamre,[1] the valley of Eshcol, &c.; and when Moses mentions Sarah's burial-place, he tells us it was 'before Mamre, the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan' (Gen. 23. 19). Whence came the name of Hebron I do not know, but if the foregoing reasoning be admitted, a town bearing this name must have been built within the sixty-two years that elapsed between Sarah's first arrival in Canaan and her death, and probably not long before her death. As Zoan was built seven years after Hebron, we are thus furnished with an approximate date to the arrival of the Hykshos in Egypt; and, as the Hykshos almost certainly came from the country immediately south of Hebron, we also see the association which led Moses to connect the building of Zoan with that of Hebron.

By a not very dissimilar train of reasoning to that we have been following, we may, I think, arrive at a fair notion as to the date of certain events which seem to form epochs in the history of the countries lying on the Euphrates.

Judging from their later history, we might be led to suppose that the plains watered by the Euphrates and its tributaries were always the seat of a great monarchy. But, as we have seen, they were peopled by different races, who only occasionally coalesced into a united people. At first the Cushites were dominant (Gen. 10. 10), but in the time of Abraham the supremacy had passed to the men of Elam (Gen. 14. 5). In the lowest and therefore the oldest parts of some very ancient mounds, inscriptions have been found which mention a certain king described as king of Ur and king of Accad and Sumir.[2] Ur appears to have been the name of the city whose ruins are now called Mugheir, lying in the district which Ptolemy assigns to the Khaldaioi of the southern Euphrates. This place was called by the Greeks Khaldaiopolis, a city of the Chaldees, and as we find

[1] The 'plain of Mamre' which appears in our Authorized Version is not a correct translation.

[2] [A great part of the following discussion has been given already in the ethnological and geographical speculations in Chapter VI. See pp. 161 sqq. above.]

another Ur on the eastern arm of the Euphrates, north of Assyria, in the district where the northern Khaldaioi seem to have been settled, perhaps we may infer that the Chaldees were in the habit of giving to their capital the name of Ur—which is probably nothing more than a variant of the Hebrew *'îr*, a city; and may venture to draw the further inference that the king of Ur was a Chaldean chief, who gained an ascendency on the Euphrates after the discomfiture of the Elamite confederacy by Abraham. The name of this Chaldean king, if such he were, is represented by two cuneiform characters, one of which has a well-known phonetic value, while that of the other has not yet been satisfactorily determined. The name is generally written Ur-ukh, but there are Assyriologists who prefer giving to the united symbols the form of Ur-kham, and they suppose this name to be represented by the Orchamus of Ovid (Metam. 4. 212);

> 'Rexit Achaemenias urbes pater Orchamus, isque
> Septimus a prisci numeratur origine Beli.'

This king, whatever was his name, appears to have been a great builder, and to have founded a dynasty, for his son Ilgi is mentioned, and other kings who seem to have been his descendants. His signet was discovered in one of the explorations. At a later but still very early period, a monarch named Hummarabi, 'king of the upper country,' makes his appearance, and the Kassi appear on contemporary monuments as the ruling race. This people I would identify with the Kossaioi of Ptolemy and the Cush of Genesis. Some centuries afterwards the tide of Assyrian conquest swept down the Euphrates, and the vicissitudes the country passed through are the subject of ordinary history.

The drift-lands at the mouth of the Euphrates are seamed with deserted river-beds and the rivers that now flow through these lands cannot represent the ancient water-courses. We have no means of fixing the spot where the united streams watered the Garden of Eden. But there can be little doubt

that the whole district was known by the name of Havilah in Scripture, and that the tribes that lived there were the Khaulataioi of classical geography (Strabo 46. 4. 2). This district is generally represented as the eastern border of the tribes that roamed over the northern desert, e.g. of the Ishmaelites (Gen. 25. 18), and of the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15. 7). East of Havilah was Elam, and north of Elam Susiana—that is, the district dependent on the town of Shushan. Daniel (8. 2) represents this capital as being in 'the province of Elam'; but it was probably inhabited by a *mixed* population, and this population is clearly distinguished from the Elamites by Ezra (4. 9). The classical writers generally represent their Susa as a *Kissian* town.

There is an Assyrian inscription which enables us to fix within narrow limits the date of the Elamite supremacy on the Euphrates. Assur-bani-pal (Sardanapalus) flourished in the ninth century B.C., and in recounting his conquest of Elam, he tells us[1] that he restored to her native seat the goddess Nana, whom the Elamites had carried off from Erech some sixteen centuries previously. It thus appears that, shortly before the time when Abraham came into Canaan, the Elamites had conquered largely on the Euphrates, and we thus understand how they acquired the suzerainty which in his day they exercised over the neighbouring countries (Gen. 11. 5). If, as we have supposed, the defeat of Chedorlaomer by Abraham destroyed the ascendency of Elam, and ultimately led to the establishment of a Chaldean kingdom on the Euphrates, Ur-ukh may have flourished about the year 2000 B.C. He was probably chief of one of the Nahorite hordes that wandered southward.[2]

I have always looked upon the description of Eden in Genesis 2. 10 as a piece of simple geography. I have little doubt it was intended to be such by the writer, and probably no question would have arisen on the subject had

[1] Vide G. Smith's Life of Assur-bani-pal, p. 234.

[2] See above, pp. 160-163.

it not come down to us encumbered with the speculations of a most ignorant and uncritical age. The statement in the Hebrew text is plain and simple. 'A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted and became into four heads.' The word rendered 'went out,' is the same as is used in tracing the Israelitish boundaries (Josh. 19. 47, and 18. 15), and as the river was parted into four heads or branches, when it left the garden, it seems that the direction followed must have been up the stream from south to north according to the direction usually followed in the early Scriptures. Of the four heads or branches there never has been a doubt about two, viz. the Euphrates and the Hiddekel or Tigris; the other two were, I believe, the rivers called the Kerkhah and the Karun. They flow from the north and the south respectively towards Shushan, and in the neighbourhood of those ruins turn westward and flow through the drift-lands of the Euphrates. The southernmost of these two rivers I take to be the Pison of Scripture, and the drain of ancient Elam; and the northernmost to be the scriptural Gihon and the Gyndes of Herodotus (1. 189, and 5. 52). The Greek historian certainly calls the river of Shushan the Choaspes (1. 188, and 5. 52), but nothing is more common than for a river to take different names in different parts of its course.

The Kossaioi were a formidable people, and as Strabo informs us (17. 1. 18) on one occasion sent no fewer than 13,000 archers to aid the men of Elam in their wars with Susiana. They boasted they had never been conquered by the Persians, and Alexander was obliged to undertake a campaign against them before he could secure their submission.

We have seen[1] that Daniel locates Shushan in the Province of Elam; it must, however, have bordered closely upon the land of Cush. Herodotus speaks of Memnonian Shushan (7. 151), and of the Palace called the Memnonia

[1] See p. 330.

(5. 53). Memnon was son of Kissia according to Aeschylus (Strab. 15. 3. 2), or of Eōs according to the Odyssey (4. 188), and he is described in the Theogony (984) as king of the Ethiopians. Strabo tells us (15. 3. 2) that the father of this mythical king built Susa, and moreover that the acropolis was called Memnonion [1], and the people Kissioi. I suppose this name of Kissioi to be a varied form of Kossaioi.

The inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes and of the other Achaemenian princes appear in three languages, the ancient Persian, the Assyrian, and a third language which has given no little trouble to philologists. More than one scholar has attempted to explain its structure. As they discovered in it peculiarities which reminded them of certain Finnish languages, they were led to place it among what are called in modern phrase the 'Turanian languages.' I must confess I do not think the resemblances noticed warranted the conclusion arrived at. As well as I can make it out, the language stands apart from all the languages with which we are at present acquainted. The Achaemenian inscriptions are, with a few exceptions, to be found in Persia proper or in the highlands running north of Shushan; and in the neighbourhood of the lake Urumiah inscriptions are said to be still extant, written in the imperfectly known language without accompaniment in Persian or Assyrian. The line of country lying north of Shushan is the one usually assigned to the Kossaioi (Strabo 11. 13. 6), and I believe it to be the 'land of Cush' (Ethiopia) mentioned in Genesis 2. 13. To these Kossaioi I am tempted so assign the language in question, and such attribution may suggest a reason why the Persian kings selected the three languages we find on their inscriptions. The old Persian was the language of the 'Medes and Persians,' that is of the race then dominant; the Assyrian that of the

[1] Aeschylus (Persae 17) seems to have looked on Ecbatana, Susa, and the Kissian stronghold as the principal places in Persia, and distinguishes Susa from the Kissian town (Ib. 120). Did he look on Susa and the Memnonium as different places?

people they had supplanted, and the third language may have been that of the Kassi, which at a still earlier period was the means of communication employed by the government of the day when it issued its commands to the subject races.

The kings of Assyria, after the conquest of Babylonia, styled themselves not only kings of Assur but also kings of Accad and Sommar [Sumir].[1] Accadi were probably settled in the south of Babylonia, and the prevalent opinion seems to be, that the Sommari dwelt south of the Accadi. As I think it probable that the Sommari were the Zimri of Jeremiah (25. 25), I have myself no difficulty in assigning them such a locality. When the prophet poured out the Lord's fury he handed the cup to the nations lying in a circuit round Sheshach (Babylon) before he made the guilty capital itself to drink of it. After dealing with the western kingdoms, Judaea, Egypt, Tyre, &c., he hands the cup to 'all the kings of Arabia, and all the kings of the mingled people that dwell in the desert, and all the kings of Zimri, and all the kings of Elam, and all the kings of the Medes, and all the kings of the North' (Armenia), &c., 'and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them.' Here we find Zimri placed between Arabia and Elam, that is in a district apparently bordering on the Persian Gulf, and where the modern name of Shomer seems to retain traces of the ancient name of Sommari. It is true that Ishmaelites now dominate in this country, but there have been many changes among the peoples of the district, and the Ishmaelite population cannot date earlier than the Mahometan conquest. The intercourse between this part of Arabia and East Africa has been at all times of the most intimate kind, and has given rise to much comment on the part of recent travellers.

[1] This title is also assumed by 'Urukh,' whose name and history we have already touched upon (vide p. 329). Another title affected by these old Babylonian monarchs was 'king of the four languages.' The scholar who shall satisfactorily show what was meant by these 'four languages' will put the student of history under deep obligation.

CHAPTER XI.

Modern speculations on language; the terms Semitic, Indo-Germanic, Aryan and Turanian, why objectionable. — Egyptian hieroglyphics the most ancient monuments of written language; may be of antediluvian antiquity; the sounds they represent probably the earliest elements of spoken language. — The Indo-European, Shemitic, and Monosyllabic languages, how distinguished; the connecting vowel a marked characteristic of the Indo-European languages. — Letter-changes which are generally supposed to be peculiar to later forms of speech sometimes found in the earliest; may be of the very essence of language. — Modern views of letter-change; Grimm's 'Laws'; their history and defects; changes of language owing to mixture of dialects, &c.; editorial corrections of our English classics how far allowable; proposed revision of the English Bible; its language not unfrequently depraved owing to the ignorance of former editors.

Compound terms; their character adjectival, prepositional, &c. The connecting vowel represented in ancient Celtic by *o* or *u*; *bard-o-cucullus, all-o-broges, virg-o-bretus*, &c.; began to fall into disuse about the Christian era, *Lug-u-dunum* and *Lugdunum, Ver-o-lamium* and *Ver-lamium*, &c. The endings of Celtic names in *ius, ia, ium, io*; their probable origin. — Dental letters at the end of a word commonly represented by *t* in ancient Celtic; guttural letters by *c*. — The final *g* generally and the final *d* not unfrequently lost in modern Celtic; strange mistakes that have arisen from an ignorance of this principle. — The final *e* of ancient Celtic sometimes lost in the modern dialects; *b* and *v* often represented by *m*, particularly in the older dialects; *mb* and *nd* substitutes for *m* and *n*. — Loss of the initial *g*.

Celtic names of places derived from adjectival forms in *ic* and *ac*; names of places referring to some stream or water, and ending in *durum, ona*, or *ana, bius, briga*, or *briva, ritum*, &c.; names of places indicating the character of the neighbourhood and ending in *magus, ratum, varia, bona*, &c.; names of places ending in *dunum, nemetum*, &c.; names of persons ending in *rix, magulus, tigernus, vassus*.

In the inquiry on which we are about to enter, I shall purposely avoid using certain terms which recent usage has made familiar to us; and it may be well to give reasons for renouncing a phraseology that of late years has been very generally accepted. I shall not use the term Semitic, because as an Englishman addressing Englishmen I prefer the English word Shemitic to a French one

introduced very unnecessarily into our language; nor the term Indo-Germanic, because it originated in a narrow spirit of nationality, and fails to express the meaning it was intended to convey; nor the terms Aryan and Turanian, because I am no believer in the theory which suggested them. We may perhaps admit that the men who wrote the Vedas called themselves Aryas; that the inhabitants of ancient Media were called Arioi (Herod. 7. 62); that a large portion of ancient Persia, including Bactria, was called Ariana; that the modern Persians call their country Iran, and the district inhabited by the Turcoman and the Mongul, Turan; and that the Sanscrit-speaking race probably descended into the Punjaub by the northern passes: but I do *not* believe that the races speaking what have been called the Indo-European languages ever lived as a united people in ancient Bactria, or gave birth in its neighbourhood to the peculiar idioms which distinguish those languages. If a writer choose to apply the term Aryan to Sanscrit and the immediately connected dialects, there may perhaps be no great objection to his doing so, but there is not a tittle of evidence to show that Celt or Teuton, Greek or Latin, ever dwelt east of Ararat before the conquests of Alexander, and to call these races Aryan involves a serious perversion of history. The term Shemitic is in like manner open to objection, for 'Shemitic' dialects were spoken both by Hamitic and Shemitic races, but the term has struck its roots too deeply into language to be easily got rid of, and the errors it might lead to have been so often pointed out, that it can now hardly give rise to any misunderstanding. The term Indo-European has been widely accepted by philologists, and *ex vi termini* involves no objectionable theory. Attempts indeed have been made, and persistently made, to fasten one upon it; and clearly to understand the objects aimed at by these theorists it may be well to take a somewhat wider survey of the subject before us than would otherwise be necessary. In this as in most other inquiries it will be best 'to begin with the

beginning,' and in the present instance we must go in search of it as far as Egypt.

In that mysterious land we find the earliest specimens of written language. Not a few of its inscribed monuments were erected before the time of Abraham, and from them we gather that even at that early period the system of hieroglyphical writing had reached a high degree of perfection. From the well-known passage in Clemens Alexandrinus we learn that the hieroglyphics conveyed their meaning either directly 'by means of the first elements,' or symbolically. As to the symbolical hieroglyphics, it will be sufficient to illustrate their nature by one or two examples: a circle was used 'symbolically' to represent the sun, a crescent to represent the moon; two hands uplifted to signify prayer, two legs to signify walking, &c. The majority of hieroglyphics belonged to the class first mentioned by Clemens, and the great difficulty which underlies our inquiry is to settle what is meant by the phrase 'the first elements.'

Our early Egyptologists supposed 'the first elements' to be the initial letters of Coptic or old Egyptian words, and that the representations of the things indicated by such words were used in hieroglyphic writing as mere letters. There are certainly many hieroglyphs the origin of which can be explained on this hypothesis; for example, the figure of a lion stands for the letter *l*, and in Coptic *labo* means a lion; in the same language *akem* is an eagle, and in hieroglyphics the figure of an eagle stands for *a*, and so forth. But there is a large number of hieroglyphs which cannot be so explained; and there is one very serious objection to the hypothesis—the word *stoikheia*, which I have rendered 'elements,' is not used in classical Greek to signify letters. In the language of Plato, which we might expect Clemens to affect, *stoikheion* denoted a simple sound, the first element of language, and, if I read the Cratylus aright, is clearly distinguished from letter or syllable. Again, we have Philo Byblius stating that it was

the god Thoth 'who invented written characters for the first elements.'[1] Here it seems impossible to render the phrase 'the first elements' by initial letters, and I cannot persuade myself that it ever had that meaning in Greek literature. The whole question is one of difficulty, and before I venture to add my own guess to the guesses of the many who have preceded me, it may be necessary to premise some remarks to make it intelligible.

When a word is represented in ordinary hieroglyphics we sometimes find affixed to it what has been called a determinative, in other words a symbolical hieroglyph to determine its nature and property. Thus to words indicating some office or character of man, the figure of a man is sometimes affixed, and the figure of a jar to words signifying liquids, &c. It is as if to the English word *fir* we were, for the sake of clearness, to add the parenthesis (a tree), and to the word *fur* the parenthesis (a skin). It is obvious that when these determinatives were introduced the accompanying hieroglyphic must have borne a phonetic value; and it is now generally agreed that such phonetic value is sometimes syllabic, sometimes merely literal. Occasionally we find a word, sometimes represented by one or more syllabic hieroglyphics (if we may use the phrase), and sometimes exhibiting its full complement of letters, much as in our own language we may represent a well-known word by the characters *knt*, or in full by *knight*. Owing to these variant characters facilities are afforded for ascertaining the phonetic value of many hieroglyphics.

The difficult question recurs, what was meant by 'the first elements,' as used by Clement of Alexandria? The answer which seems to me encumbered with fewest difficulties is that which maintains they were the roots—that is, the elementary sounds which underlie *all* language. It is certainly difficult to conceive how even Greek intellect could at so early a period have penetrated so deeply into the mysteries of language—particularly when we note the

[1] *ὃς εὗρε τὴν τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων γραφήν.* Sanchuniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 22.

strange blunders committed when the speculations were reduced to practice. But this inconsistency need not surprise us. No one will now question the truth of the great principles enunciated by Bacon, but who would now accept some of his applications of those principles?

I gather from the passage in Clement that he considered hieroglyphic writing to consist partly of picture-writing or, as he terms it, symbolical hieroglyphics, and partly of hieroglyphics bearing a phonetic value. Modern inquiries have shown that the particular meaning attached to these phonetic hieroglyphs was in many cases settled by determinatives, i. e. by symbolical hieroglyphs attached to them. The *sounds* they represented were, I believe, the names of the things represented when the hieroglyphs were invented, and these there can be little doubt were invented at many different periods. Some of the Egyptian hieroglyphs must have originated in Egypt, but there were others which I believe to be of very remote antiquity, and some which may, for aught I can see to the contrary, date from before the deluge.

I lay some stress on the phrase 'Egyptian hieroglyphic,' for there is reason to believe that there were systems of hieroglyphics not derived from, though they may have been remotely connected with them. Inscriptions have been discovered, written it is said in pure hieroglyphics, that are not Egyptian. At present we know little or nothing of their origin. The arrow-headed characters which abound in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates may be traced to a period not much later than the time of Abraham, and some of the oldest inscriptions exhibit peculiarities which seem to indicate the passage from the hieroglyphic system to the one which superseded it. Perhaps the written characters which the god Thoth is said[1] to have invented for the 'first elements' may mean simply the hieratic or cursive characters, which were certainly used in Egypt at a very early period.

[1] Vide p. 337 note.

It is from these hieratic characters rather than from the hieroglyphs of the monuments that De Rougé and others are inclined to derive the Phoenician and other connected alphabets. The question, however, is one of great difficulty, and we have hardly as yet acquired the knowledge necessary to discuss it satisfactorily.

If these speculations have any value, and the hieroglyphs have really a claim to the antiquity I would claim for them, we may expect to find some of them answering to the roots of languages which have long since lost all connexion with the Coptic or any dialect that was ever spoken in Egypt. It seems to me probable that the hieroglyph answering to our dental represents, not the initial of the Coptic word *tot*, a hand, but an old monosyllabic root of language now perhaps most perfectly preserved in the Irish word *dae*, a hand. I believe that many other such monosyllables may be found in language, which illustrate and probably gave rise to hieroglyphic symbols. But it would require a long chapter to do justice to the subject, and though the inquiry be a tempting one, I cannot give more space to a subject that comes before us thus incidentally.

When a student of language casts his eye over the chaos that lies before him, in search of some clue to guide him, he can hardly fail to have his attention arrested by three remarkable groups—the Indo-European, the Shemitic, and the Monosyllabic. Other groups there are, the Tartar, the Malay, the clicking languages of South Africa, &c., that well deserve his notice, but the three above mentioned stand out distinctly from the rest, not only as regards their structure, but also as regards their literature and the influence it has exercised on the fortunes of mankind. They have long been made the subject of careful study; but different views have been and still are entertained with respect to the characteristics which distinguish them from each other. The conclusions I have myself been led to on this subject differ in several particulars from those which are generally prevalent.

In the Indo-European languages there was, I believe, a very general tendency to join together in utterance words that were closely connected by their syntax; and a connecting vowel was very commonly employed for this purpose. In the modern Indo-European languages the connecting vowel has almost entirely disappeared, but in the older forms of the Celtic and Teutonic, in the Greek, the Latin, the Sanscrit, &c., we find this element giving a marked character to the language and often subjected to rules which philologists have as yet only partially investigated. The connecting vowel is also to be found in the Shemitic dialects, but in them its influence is a subordinate one.

In the Shemitic group of languages the accidents of the root are brought into strong relief. and the changes they undergo are the chief means employed in modifying its meaning. The vowel element is lengthened, or elided, or changed into the corresponding semi-vowel; the consonantal element retains or loses its aspiration, or is dwelt on, till it becomes as it were doubled, or even repeated. Internal modifications of the root are also to be met with in the Indo-European dialects, but in a far less degree than in the Shemitic.

It need hardly be pointed out how readily the use of the connecting vowel leads to the insertion of the compounds and derivatives as they are termed, which so markedly characterize the Indo-European languages. In the monosyllabic languages the roots stand alone and tolerate neither affixes nor suffixes. We are also sometimes told that they form no compounds, but this statement is not altogether correct, for there are certain words which now have no significance when taken by themselves, but which, when combined with other words, modify their meaning. I know of no admissible definition of the term *compound* which would not apply to such a combination of words.

A very remarkable feature of the monosyllabic languages is the important part assigned to the tones. The

rules which regulate them in the Indo-European languages cannot be safely neglected by any one who aspires to the character of a scholar, but a certain knowledge of these languages may be obtained without making the tones a subject of much study. The Greek 'accents' are neglected by many who yet read Greek with decent fluency; and even educated Englishmen may not be aware that our 'accented syllable' is pronounced with a grave tone in the Scottish, and with a strong acute tone in the Irish dialects, and that such difference of tone is the chief means we have of distinguishing between the Scot and the Irishman. But in some of the monosyllabic dialects the tone is of the essence of the word, the same word taking different sets of meanings according to the tone it is pronounced with. Instead of the declensions and conjugations of an Indo-European grammar, one of the first labours of a Chinese student is to master the distinctions between these tones; and to listen to a Chinaman running through his gamut and giving to some word, *kang* for example, the different tones it may take in ordinary speech, is a strange exercise for the ear of a European. We might almost fancy ourselves listening to the lessons of a music-master, and indeed a Chinese Buddhist who had travelled in India, and had occasion to refer to the celebrated grammarian Panini, could find no fitter term to designate his calling than by terming him 'the founder of music[1].' So remote from the ordinary conception of a Chinese are the notions we generally entertain on the nature of grammar.

From the important offices assigned to the tones in various languages, and more especially in the Chinese, we may, I think, infer that they must have played a prominent part in the economy of the primaeval language. What particular functions were discharged by them we may never know, but I think it not improbable that by careful induction we may yet discover unlooked-for relations between the tones of different languages, and discover general

[1] Vide Prof. Cowell's 'Pracrit Grammar of Vararuchi,' Pref. vi.

rules which may give us a glimpse into the tonic usages of even the antediluvian language. As the South Africans substitute a click for a consonant, so it is possible that certain tones may have affected, if indeed they did not originate, certain letters. I have long suspected that in the 'entering' or abrupt tone of the Chinese, we have the representatives of the final mutes *p*, *c*, *t*, which figure so conspicuously in other languages. Whether the final letters *p*, *c*, *t*, were elaborated from the tone, or the tone was used as a substitute for the final mutes, I cannot say. We are not in a condition for discussing such questions at present; the time may come when scholars will discuss and, we may venture to hope, will settle them.

I cannot help thinking that in investigating some of the letter-changes we are dealing with niceties of languages which influenced the very earliest forms of speech. When we observe close relations which often exist between cognate letters, we are apt to suppose that the distinction between these letters is of comparatively recent date, and that it must disappear as we trace language upwards to its source. But instead of vanishing, these distinctions often become more marked the more deeply we penetrate into their history, and frequently stand out with a relief that upsets all previous calculation, and convinces us how little we yet know of the secrets of language. I have traced the letter-changes between *m* and *b*, *s* and *k*, *s* and *t*, *p* and *k*, &c., through one language after another, till the old landmarks all disappeared, and I felt as if I were passing into another world of language, and almost coming within sight of antediluvian usages.

In many languages we find groups of words differing merely in some letter-change, which bear meanings almost if not altogether identical. I have ventured elsewhere to give to this peculiarity of language the name of parallelism; and I suspect it has played a very important part in the formation of language. Most languages will furnish us with examples. In Greek we have *su*, thou; *sētes*, this year;

sukon, a fig; *mesaulos*, the inner court, &c., and also the forms *tu*, *tētes*, *tukon*, *metaulos*, &c. In the Irish we have *sochd*, silence; *se*, he; *seic*, a bone; *saim*, I am, &c.; and also *tochd*, *te*, *tec*, *taim*, &c. Generally some modification of meaning accompanies the change of letter, as in the Welsh *sag*, a choke; *tag*, a strangle; *sar*, fury, rage; *taer*, a shock; *swb*, what is pressed together; *twb*, a round lump, &c. In the Greek dialects there is a well-known parallelism between words taking the initial or medial *p*, and others taking the *k*. Of the Celtic dialects the Irish takes the guttural and the Welsh the labial; thus in Welsh we have *pump*, five; *pedwar*, four; *pasc*, Easter; *pen*, a head &c., and in Irish *cuig*, *ceathair*, *caisg*, *ceann*, &c. Though this change of letter was looked upon both by Welshmen and by Irishmen as a shibboleth from a very early period, yet I think we may still trace faint indications of there having been at one time Welsh words beginning with *c*, and forming even within the compass of the Welsh language a parallelism between the letters *p* and *c*. In the Welsh, one member of the parallelism, viz. that which was distinguished by the use of *c*, seems to have fallen into decay at a very early period, while in the Irish, the opposite one that exhibited the *p* disappeared, so as to leave no trace behind it. The history of the digamma, or, in plain English, of the Greek *w*, will further illustrate our argument. In most of the Greek dialects the sound of the *w* was unknown, while it was generally retained in the sister dialect of the Latin, though even here it was occasionally dropped, as in the example *deus* when compared with *divus*. In the Welsh the *w* holds a very prominent place, but has entirely disappeared from the Irish. The Welsh *duw* and Irish *dia* are forms answering respectively to the Latin *div-us* and *de-us*. If the reader wish to pursue the speculation further he may be referred to the attempt made in the next chapter to investigate the etymology of the name Belgae. He will there find Sanscrit derivatives taking an ending which appears sometimes as *palah* and sometimes as *balah*, while in the

corresponding examples the Greek restricts itself to the use of the *p*, and the Latin to the use of the *b*. In the earliest forms of language it is not improbable that both forms prevailed, and were both used for grammatical purposes.

After such a candid exhibition of my own views on these obscure and difficult subjects, the reader will not be surprised when I acknowledge with how little satisfaction I have followed some of the speculations which have of late years been prevalent on the nature of language. Instead of proceeding cautiously from the known to the unknown, we have 'laws' laid down to which I for one can yield only a very qualified assent. On questions so difficult we must at first be content with tentative processes, and leave to time and research the task of pointing out and correcting blunders. Our philologists mistake their little for much, they talk of philology as a 'science,' and endeavour to overawe with authority rather than convince by argument. When we read their disquisitions and squeeze out the verbiage, the residuum is too often found to be little more than a new edition of the old text *dixit magister*. Bopp, Schleicher, or Curtius quoted, the matter is supposed to be settled. Certain gentlemen show their Sanscrit scholarship by the free use of such phrases as Anuswarah, Visargah, &c., or their German reading by adopting such Teutonisms as *ablaut*, *inlaut*, *umlaut*, &c. In such cases the reader had better shut the book, for he may be pretty sure the writer has nothing better to lay before him. Whatever is worth the reader's attention may be expressed in simple English.

The 'laws,' the discovery of which is generally ascribed to Grimm, have of late years more particularly attracted notice. Their origin and history seem however to be imperfectly understood. The relations between certain letters of the classical languages, and the corresponding ones in some of our modern dialects, are too obvious to be overlooked, and have been the subject of comment even in our

school dictionaries. The Danish philologist Rask was the first who attempted to reduce these letter-changes to anything like a system, and for some time the usual reference was to 'the laws of Rask.' Grimm, in his Deutsche Grammatik [I. 584, ed. 1822], applied these laws to exhibit the letter-changes between the Greek and two of the Teutonic dialects, the Gothic and the Old High German. For this purpose he invented the formula

Greek	P.	B.	F.	T.	D.	Th.	K.	G.	Ch.
Gothic	F.	P.	B.	Th.	T.	D.	Ch.	K.	G.
Old H. Germ.	B (V).	F.	P.	D.	Th (Z).	T.	G.	Ch.	K.

This is certainly a pretty formula, and is only open to the objection that some of the 'laws' have few or no examples to rest upon. On examination it will, I think, appear to be merely an artificial arrangement, unsupported by any solid foundation in the nature of language.

When we examine the examples adduced by Grimm in support of his formula, we find him treating the Latin as a Greek dialect, and the Old Norse as a dialect of the Gothic. If we may thus slip away from the conditions of a problem, and widen the area of selection whenever the selected languages do not furnish us with the necessary letter-changes, there is no 'law' we may not establish. The followers of Grimm better his example, and discover representative languages whenever they find it convenient. This shifting of the languages rests on assumptions that are entirely unwarranted, and makes these celebrated canons, for any philological purpose, of little value. Indeed it would be easy to point out cases where they have been positively mischievous. A certain school adopts them in a spirit that almost amounts to fanaticism, and would be incredible if we did not meet with so many instances of a like superstition in other cases. It is the fashion of the day to be misled by phrases. Men light on some loose analogy, convert it into a 'law,' and then fall down and worship.

We should not dismiss the subject of Grimm's formula without noticing its omissions, inasmuch as they touch upon

points that more particularly affect our own language. The dental aspirate *th* has two sounds, the one hard and the other soft, or, if I may venture to revive terms which I introduced many years ago, the one is a whisper and the other a vocal sound, the voice being present in the latter and absent in the former. The ear at once distinguishes the initial sound of *this* from the initial sound of *thistle*; and a little consideration teaches us that the first differs from the second just as *d* differs from *t*. Grimm's formula takes no note of the difference between these two sounds of *th*. It is also singular that the difference of sound is rarely marked by difference of letter in our early dialects. The Anglo-Saxon has two characters answering to our modern *th*, viz. þ and ð, the first borrowed from the Runic alphabet, and the latter a varied form of the Roman *d*. We have MSS. which use the þ exclusively, and others which prefer the ð, but most Anglo-Saxon MSS. contain both letters. In some MSS. there seems to be a tendency to use þ as an initial, and ð as a medial letter, but I cannot call to mind any MS. in which these characters are consistently used to distinguish between the hard and soft sounds of *th*.

Like the Anglo-Saxon, the Icelandic adopted the Runic þ, but as little advantage would be got by reviving this obsolete character, and it might occasion trouble to the unlearned reader, I shall substitute for it in the following table the familiar combination *th*. The table is intended to exhibit the varied forms of the Teutonic dental answering to the hard and soft sounds of our own dental aspirate.

English.	*A.-Saxon.*	*Icelandic.*	*Danish.*	*Swedish.*	*German.*
thou	thu	thu	du	du	du
thine	thin	thinn	din	din	dein
that	thæt	thad	det	det	—
therein	thærinne	—	—	derin	darin
there	thær	thar	der	der	—
then	thanne	thá	—	—	dann
though	theah	—	dog	—	doch
this	this	thessi	—	—	dies·er
thistle	thystel	thistill	tidsel	—	distel
thin	thin	thunnr	tynd	tunn	dünn

English.	*A. Saxon.*	*Icelandic.*	*Danish.*	*Swedish.*	*German.*
thick	thic	thykk-r	tyk	—	dick
thief	theof	thjóf-r	tyv	tjuf	dieb
thaw	—	they-r	—	töa	—
thole	thol	—	—	tulle	—
thorn	thorn	thorn	tφrn	tòrne	dorn
thorp (village)	thorp	thorp	torp	—	dorf
thirst	thurst	thorsti	tφrst	tòrst	durst
thursday	thunres dæg	thorsdagr	torsdag	—	—
thirteen	—	threttan	tretten	—	dreizehn
thrall	thræl	thræll	træl	tràl	—
thread	thræd	thrād-r	traad	tråd	—
to thresh	therscan	—	tærske	tròska	dresch-en

It will be seen that the Anglo-Saxon and Icelandic *th* answers to the German *d*[1], but in Danish and Swedish to *d* or *t*, accordingly as it is hard or soft, i.e. as it is a vocal or a whisper letter. This seems to show that the difference between the vocal and whisper sounds of *th* is a peculiarity deeply rooted in the nature of our language.

It might have been wished that the compilers of our provincial glossaries had paid a little more attention to these and similar letter-changes. It is well known that the use of *v* and *z* instead of *f* and *s* is a shibboleth of our southern English; and I was once anxious to ascertain whether the use of the vocal instead of the whispered *th* was one of its peculiarities. But so greatly have our dialects been disturbed of late years by the inroads of the schoolmaster that I could not satisfy myself on the point, and I would not trust to the reports of those who had not given special attention to the subject. In many of our dialects we find the medial *th*, which in ordinary English is always vocal, represented by *d*, as *fader*, *modder*, &c. In other dialects *th* was in many cases represented by *t*. In the eastern counties I have seen inscriptions written as late as the fifteenth century wherein *followeth* was spelt *followight*; and Henry of Huntingdon, when describing the treachery of Edric, makes him exclaim to the soldiers of Edmund

[1] These rules admit of occasional exceptions, e.g. the German *tausend*, a thousand. But these exceptions are very few.

Ironside, 'Flet Engle, flet Engle, ded is Edmund,' where *flet* is the second person plural imperative of the verb to flee, and the final *t* represents the *th* of our southern dialect. In some of our Old English MSS., written I believe chiefly in the east of England, we have an interchange between *t* and *th* which is very curious, the initial *th* being always changed to *t* when it follows a word ending in *d* or *t*, and in some MSS. when the preceding word ends in *d*, *t*, or *s*. The phrases *artou*, *hastou*, &c., so common in writings of the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century, are clearly relics of the former usage, and the phrase 'now and tan,' which still survives in many of our provincial dialects, of the latter.

Peculiarities of language which are now considered as mere provincialisms, are not unfrequently met with in our classical writers; Milton for example wrote *farder* instead of *farther*. How far an editor is justified in smoothing down these provincialisms to the level of modern usage, is a question on which there have been differences of opinion. It is certainly a question of importance, and as the proposed revision of our Bible has brought it rather pressingly before the notice of English scholars, a few remarks on the subject may not be inopportune.

The eminent men who have undertaken to give us a recension of the English Bible have necessarily had their attention directed to the question what particular style of English should be followed in their translation—whether it should be archaic or modern, plain or elegant, &c. One of them has laid before the public the views he has been led to entertain on the subject[1]. For the most part I agree with him, but he will, I am sure, forgive me if I venture to say he has hardly shown the same cautious criticism when touching upon the peculiarities of his mother tongue as in scrutinizing the niceties of the classical language he has studied so long and so zealously. His remarks on the mode

[1] [Lightfoot, J. B.; 'A fresh revision of the New Testament,' p. 185.]

of rendering into English the proper names of Scripture are, I think, for the most part judicious, though I should feel inclined to take exception to the rendering of Edom by Idumaea, or of Aram-Naharaim by Mesopotamia, inasmuch as there may be doubts whether the classical and the Scriptural names do not indicate different districts. But it is when he discusses 'the changes of spelling' that I more particularly miss the precision of language and the accuracy of definition that so generally characterize his criticism. He notices without censure, and apparently with approval, the substitution by successive editors of such words as *alien*, *causeway*, *chariot*, *size*, *curdle*, *damsel*, *faulchion*, *fetched*, *fifth*, *flux*, *island*, *midst*, *more*, *months*, *owneth*, *prize*, *renown*, in the place of *aliant*, *causey*, *charet*, *cise*, *crudle*, *damosell*, *fauchion*, *fet*, *fift*, *flixe*, *iland*, *mids*, *moe*, *monethes*, *oweth*, *price*, *renowme*, &c., and he adds, 'a capricious conservatism has retained the archaic spelling in other cases, such as *fat*, *fetches*, *graff*, *hoise*, *pilled*, *strawed*, *throughly*, for *vat*, *vetches*, *graft*, *hoist*, *peeled*, *strewed*, *thoroughly*,' &c. Admitting for a moment that the changes made or suggested be desirable, can they by any licence of language be described as 'mere changes of the spelling'? The words *owe*, *fet*, *mids*, *moe*, *graff*, *hoise*, &c. differ from *own*, *fetch*, *midst*, *more*, *graft*, *hoist*, &c. in more important respects than the orthography; and though the differences between *fifth* and *fift*, and between *vat*, *vetches*, and *fat*, *fetches*, are merely dialectical, they are important, and as such should have been distinctly recognized and appreciated. The German consistently employs *fuchs* and *fuchsin* to indicate respectively the male and female fox; our own language takes *fox* from its northern and *vixen* from its southern dialect for the same purpose. Perhaps it is now too late to attempt to bring into their proper relations the varied forms of English dialect, but at any rate we ought not to shut our eyes to their real character, and stumble on contentedly in the dark. With respect to the word *causeway* it may be observed that the Latin word *calceata*, a made road, was

adopted into several modern languages, becoming *chaussée* in French and *causey* in our own language. Some editor, misled by a false analogy, corrected *causey* into *causeway*. But should the correction stand? Should it not be relegated to the *mussulmen*, *baroknights*, *Mary-Annes*, and the thousand other vulgarisms which ignorance has gendered? In the word *island* we have an editorial change of spelling which will hardly stand the test of criticism. The Anglo-Saxon *igland* answers to the German *eiland* and the Old English *iland*. Its first element is the Anglo-Saxon *ig*, an island, whose diminutive, *eyot*, is still in common use along the Thames and other south-country rivers. The word *isle*, borrowed from the Romance language, and representing the Latin *insula*, was pronounced *ile*, and some editor seems to have thought that as it was spelt with an *s*, so should be the first syllable of *iland*, of which he accordingly made *island*. Our revisionists will do good service if they restore the pure English word our translators left us.

The able critic I have been referring to acknowledges that this licence of editorial correction has its disadvantages, and that although 'the substitution of *its* for *it* (Lev. 25. 5, 'it owne accord,' edit. 1611) was imperatively demanded by the change in the language, the alteration of *shamefast*, *shamefastness*, into *shamefaced*, *shamefacedness*, is unfortunate as suggesting a wrong derivation and an inadequate meaning.' In the latter part of this criticism I cordially concur, and hope that the ill-used adjective and its derivative substantive may, as he seems to recommend, once more take their place in our English Bibles. His remark also relative to the change of *it* to *its* equally commends itself to one's judgment, though thereby hangs a tale which is probably new to him, and may be worth the telling.

Several years ago I traced the history of our personal pronouns[1], noticing the changes they had undergone from the time of the Anglo-Saxons to the present day, and

[1] Proceedings of the Philological Society, i. 277. 'On English pronouns personal.'

with respect to the neuter pronoun laid down the following propositions:—

1. That the proper genitive of *it* (*hit* Anglo-Saxon) was *his*, which kept its place in our own literature till the eighteenth century.

2. That in certain dialects *it* took a genitival meaning by virtue of its position—*it paines*, signifying *its pains*.

3. That this idiom, like other obsolete provincialisms, was used by our dramatists for the purposes of irony, &c.

4. That the genitive *its* was of recent introduction into the language, and not to be found in the authorized version of our Bible.

Like other philological papers I had published, the present one was seized upon by our bookmakers, and its contents appropriated without a word of acknowledgment. Proposition 4 gave rise to a lively discussion; and one of the disputants pointed to the passage in Leviticus already noticed as containing an example of *its* in our authorized version. But the compiler was equal to the occasion; he replied, that in the earlier editions of our Bible the reading was *it* not *its*, and as in certain dialects *it* was used with a genitival meaning, he maintained that the truth of his statement (*his* statement!) was not shaken. The phrase 'of it own accord' would not now be tolerated, and the principal interest that belongs to it is the fact that it is a mark of dialect. It was in the northern dialect that this idiom lingered longest, and his use of it raises the presumption that the translator of Leviticus was a north-countryman; just as in the phrases 'God *have*,' &c., 'to this *agree* that holy woman Anne,' &c., we detect the shibboleth of our eastern dialect, and at once point to Archbishop Parker as the writer of the Homily for Rogation week[1].

Our revisionists should keep in mind that they are in a different position from the anonymous editors of a past generation. They stand before the world as the represent-

[1] This inference has been already drawn by the Oxford edition of the Homilies, pref. p. xxxvi.

atives of England's scholarship and challenge criticism. It can hardly be doubted that their labours will affect the character of our language. Even on this ground, which they would doubtless and rightly consider a subordinate one, their responsibility is great. Our language is spoken by some seventy or eighty millions of the most restless people upon earth, and changes before our eyes daily. Whoever either by force of genius or accident of position can improve and purify it, and neglects his opportunity, lays himself open to censure. Few persons consider how much we owe to Walter Scott for the stream of wholesome English he poured into the language, or how much our means of clear and apt expression are weakened by the affectations which are daily springing up to debase our mother-tongue. Men write about 'olden times,' unaware that *olden* was merely the definite form of *old*[1], and could not be used in such a connexion; and didactic gentlemen talk of having 'proven' something, when perhaps all they have proved is their ignorance of the history of their native language. The English verb has two forms of conjugation, one of which makes the past participle end in *n*, the other in *d*. When foreign words were imported into the language and made to do the duty of English verbs, they were always conjugated according to the last of these forms, and accordingly the Anglo-Saxon verb *prof-ian*, to prove, formed its participle in *d*. But in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries an abominable custom sprang up among the Lowland Scots of conjugating these verbs according to the first form, and they invented *rang* as a preterite of the verb to *reign*, and *proven* as the past participle of the verb to *prove*. *Proven* was adopted as a legal phrase

[1] In Old English the definite form of *old* was generally *old-e*, but occasionally it took the Dutch form of *olden*. Shakespeare's archaism 'i' th' olden time' (Macb. 3. 4) was adopted some thirty or forty years ago into the refrain of a favourite song:—

'Like a fine old English gentleman all of the olden time,'

and so became familiar to the popular ear. Such was the origin of the affectation in question.

into Scottish law, and so managed to work its way into our current English. To expose these and suchlike barbarisms, is, I think, the duty of every one who has the requisite knowledge for tracing their history, and in these matters I flatter myself that I have not unfrequently done the state some service. From the phrase *y wisse* or, as it was sometimes printed, *I wisse*, our editors manufactured a verb to *wiss*. I pointed out[1] that *y wisse* was a simple adverb answering to the German *gewiss*, and that *wist*, the supposed preterite of the verb to *wiss*, was really the preterite of the verb to *wit*.[2] The result has not been on the whole unsatisfactory. The intrusive verb is gradually disappearing from our glossaries and dictionaries, though neither glossarist nor dictionary-maker has had the grace given him to say 'thank you' for the service rendered.

The preceding observations may tend to show, and it is the chief excuse I can make for the digression, how intricate and delicate is the structure of language, and yet what revolutions—I had almost said what degradations—it may pass through without exciting any but the slightest curiosity on the part of those who daily use it. The history of our modern Celtic dialects has attracted as little attention as that of our vernacular English. If we were to ask by what peculiarities they are chiefly distinguished from the Teutonic, I presume we should be told by the initial permutations; but if we were further to ask what was the history of these permutations, and when they began to give a character to the dialects, we should not readily find an answer. How far do the Irish permutations resemble or differ from the Welsh? Which is the oldest MS., Welsh or Irish, whose syntax is affected by them? Is there any trace of their use for syntactical purposes in the ancient Celtic? I cannot myself answer these questions, and will not affect a knowledge I do not possess. But there are certain letter-changes which must be ever kept in view

[1] Hist. of English Rhythms, 2. 430.
[2] Proceedings of the Phil. Soc. 2. 160.

when we attempt to explain the origin of a Celtic compound, and whose history has been as much overlooked as that of the permutations we have been referring to. These letter-changes indeed are not peculiar to the Celtic, but they are more particularly brought under our notice when speculating on Celtic etymology, and face to face with these speculations we are brought by the process of our inquiry. Before however we venture on the subject further, we must say a few words on the nature of Indo-European compounds generally.

In the great majority of languages we find compound terms ; and in the Indo-European these compounds for the most part belong to a class which may be called the adjectival, inasmuch as the relation between their elements is the same as that which exists between an adjective and its substantive. In our own language the qualifying element may be an adjective as in *blackbird*, or a substantive as in *goldfinch*, or a preposition as in *undergrowth*; but in all these cases it will be seen there is an adjectival relation between the elements of the compound. Generally the adjectival element precedes the element it qualifies, though it sometimes comes last in our modern Celtic dialects. There are cases in which the adjectival element appears to come last even in ancient Celtic; but these cases are not numerous, and, I am inclined to think, of comparatively late introduction into the language, for they often denote localities which show traces of Roman influence and civilization.

When the relation between the two elements is the same as that which exists between a preposition and its substantive, the compound may conveniently be termed prepositional. Compounds of this class are to be found in most of the Indo-European languages, and with a little care may be distinguished from the adjectival compounds. It is readily seen that such compounds as *interregnum*, the interval between two reigns, *intervallum*, the space between two valla, &c., are compounds of a different class from *internuntius*, the messenger between two parties, *interpunc-*

tum, the point between two members of a sentence, &c.; and equally obvious is the distinction between the English *underground, outlaw*, &c., and the adjectival compounds *undergrowth, outskirt*, &c. The prepositions which enter into prepositional compounds are in most languages comparatively few in number; and we must not assume the existence of prepositional compounds till it has been shown that analogous forms exist in the language we are dealing with. Occasionally, however, a prepositional form attains a great prominence in a language. Thus from the Welsh *ar*, upon, come *argoed* a woodland (*coed* a wood), *arfynydd* a highland (*mynydd* a mountain), *arfor* a maritime district (*mor* the sea), &c.[1] This prepositional form appears to have existed from the earliest period of the language.

There are other kinds of compounds besides the adjectival and the prepositional, but these two are by far the most important; indeed four-fifths of the compound terms used in language belong to the first of these two classes.

As we are dealing more particularly with languages that belong to the class called the Indo-European, it is very important we should have clear views as to the nature and properties of the connecting vowel. It is to be regretted that the writers of our school grammars have paid so little attention to this element, for it often throws important light on the structure of the classical languages. The Anglo-Saxon *treow*, a tree, was also written *treo* without the *w*. The Greek word answering to *treow* was *dru-s*, an oak; and like the Anglo-Saxon *treow* this word *drus* seems occasionally to have taken a final digamma, i.e. a final *w*, and sometimes to have dropped it. I draw this conclusion from comparing the compound *dru-o-tomos* (*druϝ-o-tomos*), timber-felling, with its synonym *dru-tomos*. Again, the meaning of the term *oloophrōn* has given rise to great differences of opinion. It is applied to Atlas (Od. I. 52), to Aiētes, king

[1] The change of the initials in *coed, mynydd, mor*, &c., is in accordance with modern Welsh usage. In ancient Celtic these changes are rarely met with.

of Kolkhis (Od. 10. 137), and to Minōs (Od. 11. 322); and is generally rendered 'the sagacious,' 'the sound-minded.' Were this the true meaning, *oloophrōn* must be compounded of *hol-os*, whole, and *phrēn*, mind. But such a compound would certainly take the form *hol-o-phrōn*. *Olo-o-phrōn* must surely be derived from *olo-os*, deadly, and must indicate a man of deadly purposes. How suitable such an epithet would be for Aiētēs or Minōs is obvious enough, though it may be difficult to show that it is applicable to Atlas. There are however critics, and Casaubon is one of them, who so read the passage (Od. 1. 52) as to give the epithet not to Atlas but to his daughter Calypso, and to designate *her* seductive arts it would not be inappropriate. In every two or three pages of a Greek lexicon we find words whose peculiarities have been obscured, or whose meaning has not been thoroughly drawn out, owing to the little attention that has been paid to the connecting vowel.

The disuse of the connecting vowel is an important epoch in the history of a language. In our own language it seems to have disappeared early. The restless spirit of adventure which characterized our ancestors brought with it revolutions of language, and hardly a trace of the connecting vowel can be found in the Anglo-Saxon. But in the sister-dialects of the continent it long survived, and formed one of their most marked characteristics. This is distinctly brought under our notice when we compare the Frankish name Chlod-o-vicus with the Anglo-Saxon Hloth-wig, and Herman-o-ricus with the Anglo-Saxon Eorman-ric.

The connecting vowel in ancient Celtic generally appears as an *o* or a *u*. But we find no trace of it in the dialects as now spoken, nor even in Celtic MSS.; it is only in Greek or Latin that we find Celtic words in their original integrity. Martial twice uses the word *bardocucullus* to signify a Gaulish garment; and in Owen Pughe's Dictionary we have the entry 'barddgwccwl, the bard's cowl or *bardocucullus*.' We need not stop to inquire whether *barddgwccwl* be a genuine recognized Welsh word, or one coined by

Owen Pughe in imitation of the Latin; all we are at present concerned about is, to note how the modern compound *barddgwccwl* rejects the connecting vowel preserved in bard-o-cucullus. The Scholium on Juvenal (8. 13) informs us that the name Allobroges properly meant foreigners; and the Welsh, *allfro* a foreigner, compounded of *all*, another, and *bro* (in ancient Celtic *brog*)[1] a country, is evidently the same word, *b* being changed to *f* to satisfy the modern requirements of the language. The connecting vowel which we find in All-o-broges is lost in *all-fro*. Again, Caesar (B. G. 1. 16) mentions an officer of the Aedui named the Vergobretus, who was elected annually, and had the power of life and death. From Gaulish coins (Rev. Num. 1837, p. 12) it appears that an officer bearing the same title and doubtless possessing the same powers was recognized in other Gaulish states. Now we learn from Sidonius Apollinaris (Lib. 6, Epist. 4) that the Gaulish word *vargus* meant a robber, and as the Irish word *brath* or *breith* signified a judge,[2] there can be little doubt therefore that verg-o-bret-us meant the robber's judge. Lhuyd started an Irish etymology, fear-go-breith,[3] literally man-for-judgment, *breith* signifying judgment as well as judge, and so well pleased was he with his etymology that he was led by it to adopt the strange theory of an Irish settlement of Great Britain anterior to the Welsh settlement (Arch. Brit. Pref.). Lhuyd was a scholar, and the common Latin formula 'II viri I.D.' may have suggested to him his etymology, though the analogy was too remote to justify it. I know of no Irish

[1] See p. 362.

[2] O'Reilly gives no authority for his definition '*brath*, a judge,' but when noticing 'breith,' quotes Cormac's glossary as his authority.

[3] This is the etymology which is commonly accepted both in this country and on the Continent. W. Humboldt, who adopts it, attributes it to [O'Brien through] Oberlin (Urb. Hisp. p. 157). Zeuss renders Vergobretus by 'judicium exsequens, *guerg*, efficax,' an explanation which requires to be explained. Mommsen derives Vergobretus 'von der Keltischen wörtern *guerg* = wirker and *breth* = gericht' (Rom. Gesch. 5. 7). Where Mommsen got his Keltish word *guerg* I do not know; I have looked for it in the Irish, Erse, Manx, Welsh, Cornish, and Breton, but cannot find it.

compound that runs parallel with *fear-go-breith*;[1] and I believe if Lhuyd had thoroughly mastered the nature and history of the connecting vowel, we should never have heard of such a compound; and moreover, that, if W. Humboldt had arrived at clearer notions on the subject, he would not have allowed the Scholiast to mislead him as to the proper analysis of the word All-o-brog-es (Urb. Hisp., p. 156).

The custom of tying together the elements of a compound by means of a connecting vowel seems to have been going out of use before the Romans came into any very close connection with the Galli proper. Both Lyons and Leyden were called Lugdunum, or the tower-fortress, *lug* Corn. a tower[2]; but the more ancient name appears (Dio Cass. 46. 50) to have been Lug-u-dunum, or in Greek, Loug-ou-dounon. The omission of the connecting vowel was particularly frequent after the liquids. Verulamium lay on the river Ver, and there can be little doubt that the proper analysis of the name is Ver-u-lami-um, the latter element being identical with the river-name Leam, though I do not find it recognized as a Celtic word in our dictionaries.[3] On British coins we have both forms Verulamium and Verlamium. A like tendency to drop the connecting vowel is found in other languages. The people whom the Greeks called Sauromatai were called by the Latins Sarmatae. The Russian *Sjevr* means the North, and Saur-o-matai no doubt meant the northern Matai or Medes.

The name of Verolamium calls our attention to a class of letter-changes which are difficult to explain, though we must not pass them over without an attempt at explana-

[1] *Erin go bra* may suggest itself. But *Erin go bra* is a mere cry, not a compound term like the supposed *fear-go-breith*.

[2] Camden was not aware of the existence of this Cornish word, but comparing Mela's Turris Augusti with the Lugo-Augusti of Antoninus's Itinerary, he inferred (and rightly) that in ancient Celtic *lug* meant a tower (vide Brigantes).

[3] Leam is probably the same word as our provincial term *fleam*, a water-course. The Welsh initial *ll* generally became *fl* in English, as in Fluellin, Floyd, floor, &c., for Llewellyn, Llwyd, llawr, &c.

tion. In Latinizing Celtic names, the Romans generally added one or other of the nominatival endings *a*, *e*, *o*, *um*, *us*, or *is*; but occasionally they added the endings *ia*, *io*, *ium*, or *ius*. I suspect that in most cases the *i* represented some affection of the Celtic final consonant. The Latin Colonia has now become Cologne, where the *gn* takes the place of the Latin *ni*. Now we know that in the Celtic dialects the final *n* was subject to a variety of pronunciation. We find it represented in MSS. by *n*, *nn*, *nd*, *dn*; and in certain Breton words *n* is pronounced precisely like the French *gn*. As the Latin *ni* has become the French *gn*, so conversely the earlier Celtic *n* may have been pronounced like *gn* and given birth to the Latin *ni*. We find this letter-change in endings which we have reason to believe are the same as the plural-ending *on* of our modern Welsh—to wit, in *Damnonii, Caledonia, Bononia, Genounia*,[1] and though the *gn* of Boulogne may certainly represent the Latin *ni* just as the *gn* of Cologne represents the *ni* of Colonia, I am inclined to consider it to be the original Celtic pronunciation of the *n*. The close connexion between the Latin *ni* and the modern *gn* is shown in other examples. The name of the river Duran-ius dentalized the *r* into *rd*, and in the middle ages became Dordon-ia, and is now the *Dordogne*[2]. Dinia is become *Digne*, Avenio *Avignon*, &c. As we might expect, the Portuguese *Minho* represents the classical Minius, and the Italian *Trigno* the Trinius, and *Bologna* Bononia.

The Celtic *l* had also a variety of pronunciations. In Welsh it sometimes takes the sound generally represented by *ll*, and in certain Breton words is pronounced like the French *l* mouillée. Such may have been its pronunciation in Cabellio, now *Cavaillon*, and in Lug-u-vallium, the name

[1] Pausanias, 8. 43. 4.

[2] The Duranius took its rise in the Mons Duranius, now the Mount Dore, or, as the French choose to write the name, the Mount D'or. This mountain gives rise to the little river Dore, which is shortly joined by another little river said to be called the Dogne, whence the name Dordogne (Scrope's Volcanoes, p. 114 n). This etymology reminds one of the celebrated derivation of Thames from Thame and Isis!

given to Carlisle in the Antonine Itinerary. The latter name signifies the tower of the wall, or the wall-tower, *lug*, Cornish a tower, and *Gwawl*, Welsh the wall—the second *u* being the connecting vowel. In Breton the Celtic dental is very often changed into a sibilant, and I suspect first took the form of *ty*. Many Latin names ending in *tio* or *tia* take a simple sibilant in French, w or z or tz in Italian or German; thus Saletio is now *Seltz*, Tinetio *Tinzen*, Brigantia *Bregentz*, Vicentia *Vicenza*, Vesontio *Besançon*, &c. In some other cases it is more difficult to trace the letter-changes.

The final dental of modern Celtic generally answers to a *t* in ancient Celtic, and the final *g* to *c*. Thus the Welsh *rhyd*, a ford, answers to *rit* in ancient Celtic, and the Irish *rodh*, Welsh *rhath*, a plain, to *rat*; while the Welsh adjectival endings *ig* and *awg* are generally represented by *ic* and *ac* in the older dialect. But a more marked difference between the older and the later Celtic consists in the loss of certain consonants. The final *g* of ancient Celtic is no longer pronounced either in the Welsh or the Irish, though it is still represented in written Irish by *gh*; thus the old Celtic endings *magus*, *rix* (reg-s) and *tigern-us* answer to the Irish *magh* a plain, *righ* a king, and *tighearna* a lord, and to the Welsh *mai*, *rhi*, and *teyrn*. It is astonishing how many blunders have been committed by our etymologists owing to their ignorance of this simple rule. Asser tells us that Nottingham was called in the British tongue Tignocobauc, i.e. 'the cave-houses'—the allusion evidently being to the caves excavated in the cliff which bounds the Trent valley to the westward. The explanation of the name is a very simple one, yet every attempt to explain it which I have met with has been a failure. The Welsh *ty*, a house (plural *tyan*), answers to the Irish *tigh*, and from the Welsh *ogof*, a cave, may be regularly formed an adjective *ogofawg*; so that *tyan ogofawg*, or in ancient Celtic *tign ocobauc*, would be the cave-houses[1]. Again, the Welsh

[1] Kemble by some strange oversight represents Nottingham as being the

word *bro*, a country, was formerly written *brog*,[1] which is preserved in the old Celtic name *Allo-brog-es*,[2] the foreigners, *all* (Welsh) another. A recent writer, unaware of the loss of the *g* in *bro*, divides the compound thus, Allo-broges, but does not inform us what to make of the last element *ges*. Mr. Algernon Herbert (Irish Nennius, xxxii) suggests the Welsh word *mai* as the first element of the British name Maeatae, which he supposes to mean the men of the plains. But *mai* in ancient Celtic most certainly took the form, not of *ma*, but of *mag*. The writer last but one referred to tells us that *magh* is 'decisively Gadhelic, and is therefore very useful as a text word in discriminating between the districts peopled by the two great branches of the Celtic stock' (Mr. I. Taylor's Words and Places, 244). This is an unfortunate mistake. *Mai* and *magh* are merely different forms of the same Celtic word, varying indeed in their orthography, but having nearly the same pronunciation.

The final dental is generally pronounced in Welsh, and though commonly not pronounced in Irish, it still keeps its place in the written language under the form *dh* or *th*, the modern name *Moira* answering to the Irish *Magh-rath*, the plain of the *rath* or fortress. Keeping in mind this loss of the dental, we can understand how the Italian name *Ivrea* may represent the classical name Eporedia, and the French Soleure, Salodurum. As the Celtic dental is in most cases brought under the reader's eye in the written Celtic, the present letter-change has led to much less etymological blundering than the one we have been last considering. Blunders however there are, even under this head, and among them one, perhaps of all the most discreditable to modern scholarship, I mean the mistake so common among continental scholars, which identifies the word Gael with Gall-us [3].

British 'Tingobauc or Urbs Speluncarum. Asser 868.' He does not give any derivation of the name.

[1] [Williams, Lexicon Cornubrittanicum s. v. *Bro*.]

[2] See above, p. 357.

[3] See above, p. 40.

It seems pretty clear that in certain cases the modern Celtic has lost a final vowel. There can be little doubt that the name Alemanni answers to the Welsh word *Allman*, a stranger—*all* another. *man* a place. But this derivation does not explain the *e* in *Alemanni*. Now the Alemanni invaded the country of the Belgae, who were almost certainly an Irish people,[1] and in Irish *al* takes the form of a dissyllable—*aile* or *eile*. The proper analysis of the name seems, therefore, to be Alle-mann-i. According to Dioscorides (4. 42), the Galli called the cinque-foil 'pempedoula,' which is evidently compounded of the Welsh *pump*, five, and *dail*, leaves. But when these words were combined to form the compound term pempedoula, *pump* must have been a dissyllable answering to the Greek *pempe*. The proper division of the word must, therefore, be pempe-doul-a. The name of Armorici is derived from the Breton adjective *armor*, on the sea; but we also find the name written Aremorici. Zeuss (2. 836) supposes *are* to be an ancient form of *ar*. I have never met with the preposition in this dissyllable form, but such a form may have once existed, and it would explain the meaning of Are-late. Arelate (Arles) lay at the apex of the Delta of the Rhone, and Camden supposed it to mean 'on the wet lands'—*llaith*, Welsh, that which is dank or humid. In like manner the compounds Mori-kambē, Mori-marusa, Mori-dunum, may lead us to infer that the Welsh *mor*, the sea, was in ancient Celtic a dissyllable, answering to the Latin *mare*, for there can be no doubt as to the significance of the element *mori*.[2] Again, Ptolemy (2. 14.) locates in the basin of the Danube certain tribes which he calls Ambilikoi, Ambidrauoi, Ambisontioi, &c. i. e. dwellers on the Lech, on the Drave, on the Isonta, &c. Our first notion might be that some Greek race had intruded itself into this district, and that we had here names derived from the Greek preposition

[1] See Chap. XII.

[2] If the reader wish to investigate the etymology of a particular name, he may consult, and will generally find a reference to it in the Index.

amphi. But *ambi* may have been a Celtic word, for the Irish preposition *um* or *im*, about, enters into composition, e.g. in the adjective *imlioc* bordering on a lake; and as there is a dissyllabic form of this preposition, viz. *uime*, and as the change of *m* into *mb* is one of the commonest of the Celtic letter-changes, *uime* may very possibly represent Ptolemy's *ambi*. Again, in the Antonine Itinerary (No. 351) we meet with a station called Penne-locos, situate in the basin of the Rhone. M. de Saulcy identifies it with 'la moderne Villeneuve, le caput Lacus du Moyen age' (Rev. Arch. for 1861, p. 446); and he supposes it to be the Welsh compound *pen-loch*, the head of the loch. The hypothesis that *pen* was in ancient Celtic a dissyllable, *pene*, would support this etymology, and at the same time would explain difficulties that are met with in several English names of places.

V is in Celtic a common permutation both of *b* and *m*. In Welsh the permuted letter is represented by *f*, in Irish by *bh* and *mh*; but *f*, *bh*, and *mh* are all alike pronounced as *v*. In old Celtic *b* and *v* freely interchange with each other, and not unfrequently with *m*. The French Cévennes is called by Caesar (B. G. 7. 8), according to some MSS., Cebenna, according to others Cevenna, and is evidently the same word as the Welsh *cefyn*, a ridge, which, under the form of Chevin, occurs so often in the topography of the Welsh border. But in Strabo (2. 5. 28, p. 128) we have 'Kemmenon oros,' which is evidently nothing more than the Chevin ridge. Again, a city which lay on the Corbones, a tributary of the Guadalquiver, is called by Appian (Hispan. 25. 58) Carbōnē, while Hirtius (Bell. Alex. 57. 64) calls it Carmona, and Strabo (3. 2. 2, p. 141) Karmōn. Hence we may see the connexion between Bor*b*et-o-magus, i. e. the Borbet-plain, and the medieval Wor*m*at-ia, now Worms; between Borco*v*-ic-um, the name of one of the stations on Hadrian's Wall, and Barcu*m* [Barcombe], the name of a hill in its neighbourhood; and between the names Domnorix and Domnobellaunos, which have the stamp of classical

authority, and the names Dubnorix and Dubnovellaunos, which appear on Celtic coins. Our modern Celtic dialects often exhibit duplicate words, beginning with *m* and *b*. In Breton *bendem* (vintage), *bent* (mint), *balafen* (a butterfly), *begin* (bellows), &c., are also written *mendem*, *ment*, *malafen*, *megin*, &c.; in Welsh we have both *meru* and *beru*, to drop; and the Irish *marach*, to-morrow, is also found written *barach*. I shall repeatedly have occasion to call the reader's attention to the interchange between these two letters in the older Celtic.

Again, *mb* and *nd* interchange respectively with *m* and *n*, particularly before a vowel. Dio Cassius (39. 85) calls the Lacus Lemanus, the lake of Geneva, *Lemban-os*, and the Alemanni *Alambann-oi* (77. 14). So we may understand how the first element of Camb-o-rit-um (Cambridge) may represent the river which we now call the Cam; and how the old Celtic ambactus, a servant, a retainer,[1] may be represented by the modern Welsh amaeth, a husbandman. The river which we now call the Boyne was called by Ptolemy (2. 2) Bououinda, and by Giraldus Cambrensis Boand-us. So in Vind-o-bon-a, *Vind* certainly represents the little river *Wien*, which still gives a name to the capital of Austria; and in Vind-o-gladia *Vind* in like manner is the name of the little brook which gives name to our English Wimborn, formerly written Wim-burn, i.e. the Wim-brook.

The disappearance of the initial *g* is a very common 'mutation' in modern Celtic. In ancient Celtic we sometimes find this letter dropped even in cases when it is preserved in the extant dialects. Few will doubt that the Welsh *Gododyn* is the same word as the Ottadēnoi of Ptolemy, and the most reasonable explanation of the word Umbri is that it is a derivation of Gomer.

The Welsh adjectival ending *ig* answers to the Breton *ek*, and the old Celtic *ic*. Words formed by this ending are still occasionally used as substantives indicating places. From the Breton *brug* heath, *gwern* an alder, *ivin* yew,

[1] Caesar, B. G. 6. 15, makes it a retainer.

&c., are formed the adjectives *brugek* heathy, *gwernek* abounding in alders, *ivinek* abounding in yews, &c. These adjectival forms are also used as substantives, with the meanings, a heath, an alder-bed, a place abounding in yews, &c. In like manner we find the Old Celtic adjectives used as substantives. Thus *Avaric*-um (Bourges) must have taken its name from the Avara, the river on which it stood; and *Autric*-um (Chartres) in like manner from its river, the Autura. These derivations are obvious, and are noticed, though not explained, by Walckenaer (Géogr. I. 373 and 399). Again, from *mor*, the sea, the Breton gets two derivatives, the one with, the other without, a permutation of the *m*, to wit *armor* and *arvor*, a maritime district. From the latter comes the adjective *arvorek*, maritime, which is found in the dictionaries; and from *armor* we might in like manner obtain an adjective *armorek*. From this latter form of the word certainly came the Latin term Armoric-a. Once more, in the Notitia certain troops are represented as quartered at 'Borcovico.' Our antiquaries assume that this name must be compounded of *vicus*, and they call the place Borcovīcus. Dr. Bruce[1] supposes that the root of Borcovicus was the name of a neighbouring hill called *Barcum* [Barcombe]. The hypothesis is a reasonable one, whatever we may think of the arguments adduced in support of it. If Barcum suggested the name, its derivative Borcomic may have been pronounced Borcovic by the British official who supplied the names for the Notitia. The interchange between *m* and *v* in Celtic dialects has always been so common as to render such a pronunciation probable, and I know of no other way in which 'Borcovico' can be connected with Barcum. On this hypothesis the Latin name of the station must have been Borcovĭcum, and the Borcovīcus of our antiquaries, though it has been admitted into our classical dictionaries, must be discarded.

The ending we last referred to answered to the Latin

[1] [Lapidarium Septentrionale, p. 87.]

ic-us; the Latin *ax*, gen. *acis*, answers to the Welsh ending *awg*, Irish *ach*, Manx *agh*, and Old Celtic *ac*. Adjectival forms taking these endings also appear, like those we last noticed, to have been used as nouns indicating place. Then in Welsh we have *mawn-og*, a peat pit, from *mawn*, peat; in Irish *guibhs-ach*, a pine forest, from *guibhas*, a fir; and in Manx *brain-agh*, a grinding-house, from *brain*, a handmill; and *oas-agh*, a wilderness, from *oas*, growth. The stations Juliacum (Juliers) and Tiberiacum (Tarren), some ten miles west of Cologne, are commonly said to have been named after Julius Caesar and the Emperor Tiberius; and though I am not aware of any direct authority for their statement, the probability is it was well founded. Sidonius, himself a Gaul, mentions (Epistt. lib. 2. ep. 2) an estate belonging to one Avitus, and calls it Avitacum. The Ure, a little above York, receives a small stream called the Ouse-burn, and then takes the name of the Ouse. But in earlier times it no doubt retained the name of Ure (Eure) or Ebur till it reached the sea, and the town on its banks was named Eborac-um, or, as we find it written in Nennius, Caer Ebrauc. Savern-ake forest probably received its name from lying on the Saverne[1], or boundary between two of the principal British States in the first century; and Morgann-ok, the Welsh name of Glamorganshire, from Morgan, a celebrated Welsh prince who once possessed it.

The Welsh *dwr*, Breton *dour*, water, enters freely into composition in the old Celtic; though the compounds generally indicate the town situate beside the stream or piece of water rather than the stream itself. Batav-o-durum was a town supposed to be situate on the Lek, one of the branches of the Rhine which formed the island of the Batavi. The literal rendering would be the Betuve-water—the Betuwe, or good pasture, being the name still given to the eastern portion of the island. Boi-o-durum was a town situate at the point where the Inn enters the Danube.

[1] See p. 382 below.

Opposite to it was the place called Batava Castra, from a cohort of Batavi there stationed. It was in all probability for distinction' sake that Boiodurum received its name, the water of the Boi-i; for, though we have no authority for saying that Boii were settled on this particular spot, we know that they occupied large tracts of country in the neighbourhood. Ern-o-durum, a town mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary as lying between Bourges and Bordeaux, is generally fixed on the river Arnon. This name of Arn-on is derived from the more ancient name of Arn, according to a principle we shall now proceed to investigate. Ern-o-dur-um meant nothing more than the Ern-river.

There is a peculiarity belonging to the names of rivers—Celtic names more particularly—that requires rather special notice; I mean the tendency to take what appears to be an extraneous *n* in the final syllable. Nunation plays an important part in language, but its history has been imperfectly traced. and its origin is lost in the obscurity of ages. Hundreds of Latin words ending in *o* answer to Greek words ending in *ōn*, but we cannot explain why the Latin drops the *n*, and the Greek retains it. Hence when we find the name of a river taking the *n* in one language and in another dropping it, we naturally suppose it may be merely a specimen of the nunation which occurs so frequently in language. But in the names of rivers the *n* sometimes presents itself under circumstances which evidently require a different explanation; and when I find in Irish dictionaries the word *an* or *en* signifying water, I cannot but suspect that some of these names are compounds that take this word for their final element.

Divona was an ancient name of Cahors, and the name is supposed to be derived from a noted fountain in that city. Ausonius (Clar. Urb. 14) alludes to a stream in Bordeaux having the same name:—

> 'Salve fons ignote ortu, sacer alme perennis
> Vitree glauce profunde sonore illimis opace,
> Salve urbis genius, medico potabilis haustu,
> Divona Celtarum lingua, fons addite Divis.'

The proper analysis of the word is Div-on-a, where *Div* is the Welsh *Duw*, God, *on* an old Celtic word now represented by the Irish word *an*, water, and *a* the feminine termination added when the word was latinized. The stream was looked upon as consecrated water on account of its medicinal properties, and the name was merely an anticipation of the 'holy wells' of medieval times [1].

The Shannon is called in Irish both Senn and Sionan. From the first of these names Ptolemy no doubt got his Senos, and Sionan I take to mean merely the Senn-water. Gregory of Tours calls the Somme Somma, and it is also called Somana both by him and by Fortunatus. Som-an-a, I believe, means simply the Somme-water. The Adrana of Tacitus (Ann. I. 56) was the Eder near Cassel, and Adr-an-a was probably the name by which it was best known among the Gauls. The names Salm-ona, Narb-ona, Arrab-ona, &c. may possibly require a different explanation.

The Welsh word *gwy*, water, enters freely into the modern Welsh names of rivers; e.g. Eb-wy, Llug-wy, Myn-wy, To-wy, &c.; and it must also have been known in ancient times, for there can be little doubt that the Tou-bi-os of Ptolemy was the modern To-wy. There are other examples of this form in the geography of Britain, though I am not aware of any on the Continent. In a charter which describes the boundaries of the diocese of Hereford [2], Monmouth is called *Munuwi-mutha*. The MS. is of the eleventh century, and the name *Mun-u-wi*, or the Mun-water, shows that even at this late period the connecting vowel was occasionally used in Welsh. As our ancestors drew their knowledge of these localities chiefly from

[1] Divodurum, the ancient name of Metz, has the same meaning. A stream that joins the Moselle in the neighbourhood of this city has waters that are highly saline and, it is said, medicinal; hence the name—*Div*, God, *o* the connecting vowel, and *dur-um*, water. During the siege attempts were made to extract salt out of this water, in order to supply the want of the necessary condiment, but I believe without much success.

[2] The Mundy Gospels, Pembroke Coll. Library. I had my attention first called to this curious MS. by Mr. Bradshaw.

the charters which secured them their estates, they preserved the archaic character of the names, and out of *Munuwi* made Monow, which is the modern English name of the river; but the Welsh, following the changes of their native language, dropt the connecting vowel and converted Munuwi into Mynwy. The English, however, must have known the primitive name of the river, for they called the town situated at its confluence with the Wye, Mon-mouth.

Places with names terminating in *briga* or *briva* are very numerous. They are always situated on the banks of rivers, and Cluverius (Germ. Ant. I. 62) conjectured that *briga* was the same word as the German *brücke*, a bridge. Unfortunately, neither this nor any of the cognate words is to be met with in the Celtic dialects, and *briga*s are sometimes found in places where the construction of a bridge would tax the resources even of a modern engineer. Walckenaer was not philologist enough to appreciate the first of these difficulties, but appears to have been sufficiently alive to the latter, for he stumbled into other blunders in his endeavours to escape from it. He tells us that *briga* or *briva* 'en ancient Celtique signifie pont *ou passage* d'une riviere; de la mot *bridge* en Anglais et *brücke* en Allemand,' and Mr. G. Long, following in his footsteps, considers *briva* to signify a passage or ford (vide Samarobriva in Smith's Dict. of Geog.). There is not a tittle of evidence to show that *briga* or *briva* meant either passage, ford, or ferry, but if we turn to O'Reilly's Irish Dict., we find a word that yields us a suitable meaning,

bru[1] }
bruach } a border, brink, edge, bank, &c.

Briva Iserac meant the strand of the Isera (Oise); and Samaro-brivac[2] (Amiens) the banks of the Samara, now the Somme; Dur-o-brivis (Rochester) meant literally 'at the river banks'—*dwr* Welsh, and *dur* Irish, water; and simi-

[1] O'Brien defines *bru* 'the borders or banks of a river.'

[2] O'Reilly gives *breoch* as a varied form of *bruach*.

larly Duroc-o-brivis meant 'at the lesser water[1],' now called the Ousel, to distinguish it from the main stream or Ouse.

W. Humboldt has devoted no less than three long chapters to the consideration of the ending *briva* (Urb. Hisp. 23. 25. 42). He does not accept the derivations of Astarloa and Larramendi, both of whom derive it, though by different processes, from the Basque word *uria*, a town; and he considers the derivation from *brücke*, a bridge, an improbable one. He thinks it may be connected with the Thracian word *bria*, a town, or with the second element of the compound Allobroges, or with the Greek *purgos*, or with some primitive word from which all these are derived! One hardly knows what to say when one finds the name of W. Humboldt appended to speculations such as these.

The Welsh *rhyd*, a ford, appears as *ritum* in classical geography. August-o-ritum was the modern Limoges, but why the place was honoured with the name of Augustus I cannot say. Many of the towns which in ancient geography bear the name of Augustus were either colonies established by this emperor, or were towns built by his orders. But there were others—London for example—that took his name, many years after his death; and possibly this may have been the case with Augustoritum. Camb-o-ritum (Cambridge) was so called from the ford over the Cam by which the Roman Road passed the river. Traces of the old paved road it, is said, were discovered in the bed of the river when the present bridge was constructed. The letter-change of *mb* for *m* before a vowel is very common in ancient Celtic[2].

The Irish *magh*, and Welsh *mai*, a plain, takes the form of *magus* in ancient Celtic compounds. August-o-magus

[1] *Oc* as a suffix indicated a diminutive. It was, I believe, peculiar to the Belgae or Irish dialects (vide Ch. XII), and therefore the name of Duroc must have been given to the Ousel at a comparatively late period, when the Belgae dominated in that part of Britain.

[2] See above p. 363.

was the name of a Roman station between Beauvais and Soissons; Caesar-o-magus was Beauvais in Gaul, and in Britain the name of a station between London and Colchester. The circumstances which led to these places taking the names of Augustus and Caesar are unknown. Marc-o-magus lay between Treves and Cologne, and no doubt received its name because it was situated on the plain through which ran the *mark*, or boundary-ditch, which separated the German Ubii from the Celtic Treveri. Bodinc-o-magus lay on the Po, which by the Ligurians of the neighbourhood was called Bodegk-os (Polyb. 2. 16. 12). Argent-o-Magus is generally fixed at Argent-on, south of Bourges. Argentus, or Argenteus, seems to have been a common name for Gaulish rivers. The 'Flumen Argenteum' (Cic. ad Fam. 10. 34) was the modern Argenz, which enters the Mediterranean not far from Fréjus. Argent-on was probably called from a stream of the same name, *on* being the termination which has already been the subject of discussion.

The Welsh *rhath*, Irish *rodh*, a plain, a field, may have given Leicester its ancient name of Rat-ae, the fields, the open champaign now so dear to the fox-hunter. Strasburg may have got its ancient name of Argent-o-ratum from the same root, and a stream called Argent-us, whose name reappears in Argent-o-varia.

Owen Pughe gives us the following definitions:—

Gwaer. s.m. a downward aspect, &c.
Gwaerawl a. tending downward, &c.
Gwaered. s.m. the bottom of a descent, &c.

The Welsh language forms derivative substantives in *i* as well as in *ed*; thus from *mabinawg*, juvenile, we have *mabinog-i*, infancy; from *caled*, hard, *caled-i*, hardness; from *cam*, crooked, *cem-i*, crookedness, &c.; so that there may have been once a second derivative, *gwaer-i*, synonymous with *gwaer-ed*. This hypothetical word *gwaer-i* is probably the ending of Durnovaria, the classical name for Dorchester.

I take this name of Durn-o-varia to have designated originally the huge Celtic fortress now called the Maiden Camp, and situate a mile or so south of Dorchester. It lies at the head of the steep descent leading down to Weymouth, and as Asser (A. D. 876) tells us that in the British tongue Dorset was called Durngueis, the county of Durn (*gwys*, Welsh, a country), we may analyze the classical name into Durn-o-varia, the Descent of Durn. Again, there is a descent leading from the valley of the Mold into that of the Clwyd. It is the only ready means which Nature has provided for passing from the one valley to the other, and along it the Romans most certainly carried their highway. At the lower end of the descent is *Bodvari*, which, according to our hypothesis, would mean the town or dwelling of the gwaeri —*bod*, Welsh, a dwelling; and not far from Bodvari are the ruins which Welsh antiquaries recognize as those of Varis (Mon. Hist. Brit. p. xxii).. There are two names in the ancient geography of the Continent which are probably examples of this form. Cas-uaria is located by D'Anville on a river called La Chasse, and Argent-o-varia at a place called Ertz-heim, situate on a river which runs north to Strasburg (Argent-o-ratum). The hypothesis that this river was at one time called the Argent might account for both names, Argent-o-varia and Argent-o-ratum. I have not however examined the neighbourhood, neither around the supposed site of Casuaria, or around Ertzheim, and therefore cannot say how far it would justify us in assuming that there was such a descent or *varia* as would support these speculations.

The Welsh *bon* signifies a stem, or base, &c., the Irish *bun*, a stump, a bottom, &c.[1] By combining the latter word with *ait*, a place, the Irish gets the compound '*bunait*, a foundation, dwelling, habitation.' It would seem that in ancient Celtic *bon* or *bun* meant one of those dry sites on which the Celtic villages were generally built—in short, what in the topography of our southern counties is called a *batch*.

[1] As to the change of *n* to *nd*, see p. 364.

If we suppose this word to take the Welsh plural-ending *on* we get *bonon*, which may be the origin of the classical name *Bonon-ia*, whence the French have got their Boulogne and the Italians their Bologna. Juli-o-bona was the modern Lillebonne, and August-o-bona the modern Troyes, but on what occasion these places respectively took the names of Julius and Augustus I do not know. Vind-o-bona was the name of the Celtic town, situate on the spot where the little river Wien, which gives name to the capital of Austria, enters the Danube. Had our English ancestors been the godfathers they would doubtless have called the place the Winbatch.

As a general rule we may take it for granted that the proper names of men arose from what were at one time mere appellatives. Several appellatives signifying chief or king, though now almost obsolete, were once it would seem in common use. The Irish *righ*, Welsh *rhi*, a chief, enters into a great many compounds, and in Latin takes the form of *rix*, gen. rigis. Livy (34. 46) mentions a king of the Boi-i, who was called Boi-o-rix. The name evidently signified chief of the Boi-i, as the Romans called them. Caesar mentions two Gauls that bore the name of Eporedorix. One of them was certainly a cavalry officer (B. G. 7. 39), and the other probably so, for he was taken prisoner, after what seems to have been mainly a cavalry action (B. G. 7. 67). Epored-o-rix evidently meant chief of the Epored or horse-course[1], where the cavalry were trained. In investigating the etymólogy of Cingetorix, we have first to settle the import of the prefix *cin*. In Breton, *gwir* is right, *kengwir*, a public right; *forn*, an oven, *kenforn*, the public oven; *milin*, a mill, *kenvilin*, the public mill, &c., &c. According to this analogy, from the Breton *ged*, hope, we might get the compound, *kenged*, the common or public hope. It would seem, then, that Cinget-o-rix meant the chief of the public hope or expectation, not a bad name for the several chiefs who

[1] Ep-o-red is evidently a compound formed from *ep*, a horse (vide le Pelletier's Dictionary), and the Welsh *rhed*, a course.

bear this name in history, e.g. for the head of one of the popular factions among the Treveri (B. G. 5. 3), nor for the chief who seems to have headed the popular rising in Kent against Caesar (B. G. 5. 22). The addition of a syllable gives us the name of the noble Gaul who united his countrymen in their great uprising B.C. 52. *Ver* in ancient Celtic was an augmentative prefix, *vercingetorix* meant simply the great Cingetorix.

The Welsh *teyrn*, a king, answers to the Irish *tighearna*, a lord. It enters into the Welsh compound *mad-deyrn*, a good king (*mad*, good), and *uch-deyrn*, a sovereign (*uch*, upper); and also into the Cornish *mytern*, a king, which is apparently another form of *maddeyrn*. The chief whom Bede (Hist. Ecc. I. 14) calls Vurtigernus, and Nennius (c. 37) Guorthigernus, bore a name which signified the Great Chief, for the first syllable is evidently the Welsh augmentative prefix *gwor-*, as in *gor-to*, a covering, *gwor-tho*, a roof; *llwydd*, luck, *gwor-llwydd*, prosperity, &c.; *bryd*, the mind, *gor-bryd*, magnanimity; *sedd*, a seat, *gor-sedd*, a tribunal; *gwas*, a young man, *gor-was*, a hero, &c. Dutigern, one of the Welsh chiefs who fought against Ida (Nennius, c. 66, Append.), was no doubt 'the black chief,' *du*, Welsh, black; and Kentigern, the celebrated Welsh bishop of Glasgow, who fills so large a space in the misty annals of the sixth century, was almost as certainly 'the public or the people's chief[1].'

The Irish *mal*, a prince, is probably the same word as the old Celtic Magalus, the name of the Boian chief who conducted Hannibal over the Alps (Livy 21. 29). Two of the three British chiefs who fell at the battle of Deorham (Sax. Chron. 577) were named Commagil and Farinmagil or, as some MSS. give the name, Commail and Farinmail, but I am unable to explain the first elements of these compounds. Taxi-magalus was the name of one of the Kentish chiefs who rose against Caesar by command of Cassivelaunus

[1] Jocelin, in his life of Kentigern, supposes the name of Kentigern to signify the head-chief, *ceann* Ir. a head. But Kentigern was not an Irishman; he was a Welshman, and the name was no doubt a Welsh compound.

(B. G. 5. 22). If we suppose the first element of the name to be the Welsh *tasg*, that which is agreed to be done, a task, Taximagalus may possibly indicate a vassal chief, one bound to render military or other service.

The Welsh *gwas*, a young man, enters freely into composition:—*ysgwyd-was*, a shield-bearer, from *ysgwyd*, a shield; *march-was*, a horseman, from *march*, a horse; *teyrn-was*, a royal youth, from *teyrn*, a king; *tywas*, a domestic, from *ty*, a house; *is-was*, an under servant, from *is*, inferiority, &c. The formation was also used for proper names, thus we find one *Melguas* officiating as a witness to a Welsh charter (Lib. Land. 174). The name *Melguas* had the same meaning as *teyrnwas*. I do not know whether any examples are to be found in the ancient Celtic.

CHAPTER XII.

The Belgae; the districts they occupied in the time of Caesar; the same people as the Volcae of southern Gaul, and as the Irish Fir-bolg; ancestors of the Manxmen, and a Gaelic people. — The distinguishing peculiarities of the Welsh and Irish languages may be traced in the ancient dialects of the Galli and the Belgae; interchange of *p* and *k*; of *s* and *h*; rejection in the Belgic of the *w* and *ll*; the Belgic use of the augmentative prefix *ard* and of the diminutive suffix *oc*. The notion common among continental scholars that the Galli were Gaels, and the Belgae a Cymric or Welsh people, a mistake, that has led to a singular perversion of history; the notion that the Belgae were Teutons also a mistake. — The name Germani first applied to certain marauding Celtic tribes, then to the rude Teutons beyond the Rhine; its Celtic etymology. — The name of Franks common to Celts and Teutons; its etymology; probably the same name as Phruges. — Line of demarcation between the Teutons and the Belgae in the north of Gaul, as tested by the topography of the district.

The name Belgae originally an appellative signifying the Herdsmen; given to the men who drove the cattle from their winter-retreats to pasture on the Steppe in southern Russia. — The name carried westward by the Kimmerioi when they fled before the Skuthai; given by the neighbouring tribes to the Skuthai who succeeded the Kimmerioi. — The name Tectosages widely adopted by the Belgic tribes; suggestive of the rough heavy overcoat which sheltered the herdsmen on the Steppe; the term Aigosages not a corruption but a synonym of Tectosages. — The migration from Gaul under Bellovesus and Segovesus; the emigrants led by Segovesus settled in Pannonia and Illyricum; brought into contact with Alexander 335 B.C.; invaded Greece 281 B.C.; were accompanied in this invasion by Belgic tribes. — The name of Galatai borne by a tribe settled west of the Dniester; borne also by the Belgae who passed over from Greece and ravaged Asia Minor; adopted by the Greeks as a general name for the Celtic race; probably the same as the term Galeddin, which is given to certain Belgic tribes in the Welsh Triads.

Repulse of the invading Gauls at Delphi; their settlements in Thrace, on the Danube, and elsewhere; certain of them pass over into Asia and found Galatia; allied tribes Trocmi, Tolisti-boioi, &c. — Other bands penetrated westward; founded the Volcae Tectosages and Arecomici; the Belgae of northern Gaul later immigrants; retained their independence till the time of Cæsar; established themselves in Britain before the close of the second century B.C.

From their first appearance in Gaul we find the Belgae represented as a powerful and an aggressive people,

but from what quarter they intruded themselves into the seats where we find them settled is a question difficult to answer. In the early part of the third century B.C. they seem to have been unknown to the inhabitants of Gaul—at least I can find no clear trace of them in that country, and in the course of that century they must have overrun and peopled the districts in which Caesar locates them. Perhaps our best course will be first to ascertain with precision the district in Gaul which the Belgae occupied when they first came under the notice of the Latin historians, and then endeavour to trace their ethnology and origin. Their ethnology I shall endeavour to make out partly by analyzing such Belgic terms as have come down to us, and partly by collecting such notices of these Belgic tribes as are furnished by our medieval writers. These sources of information are not altogether satisfactory, but their united testimony may fairly claim some weight in an inquiry like the present one.

Caesar, as we have seen,[1] represents the country which he calls Gallia as parcelled out among three great tribes, the Belgae, the Celtae, and the Aquitani; and he makes the line of the Marne and the Seine the southern boundary of the Belgae. His Gallia however was only a portion of the country to which we now give the name of Gaul, and consisted for the most part of the great plain which shelves to the north-west, and is drained by the Seine, the Loire, and the Garonne. The basin of the Rhone, south of its junction with the Saône, and a large portion of the Highlands in which the three rivers before mentioned take their rise, was looked upon as forming a distinct district, and was called the Province. It may be well to investigate the ethnology of the tribes there settled before we take a wider survey of the races which formed the population of this great country.

The district lying south-west of the Rhone was in the time of Caesar occupied by the Volcae. One section of

[1] See p. 40 above.

this people, the Volcae Tectosages had Tolosa (Toulouse) for their capital, and east of them were the Volcae Arecomici. The latter must have reached eastward to the neighbourhood of Marseilles, for Pliny tells us (3. 23) that in the great Gaulish movement towards Italy some of the Cenomani settled down nigh Marseilles in the country of the Volcae (in Volcis[1]); and Livy, in describing Hannibal's march through the country of the Volcae, distinctly states (21. 26) that the people dwelt on both sides of the Rhone, whence it has been conjectured that the Cavares who were settled east of the river were a tribe of Volcae. The Allobroges who dwelt south of the Rhone from Geneva to Lyons, and other small neighbouring tribes, were no doubt Galli, and on the coast east of the river were Ligures, but the larger and more important part of 'the Province' was occupied by the Volcae.

The near relationship of this people to the northern Belgae has been shown by arguments so cogent that we might reasonably have considered the question as now settled. But a writer in a recent popular work will not entertain the notion, and Niebuhr argues as if he either forgot or rejected it. There can be little doubt that Volcae and Belgae are mere variations of the same word. In all the Celtic dialects *v* is the regular permutation of *b*, and therefore the change of the initial need give us little concern. The broad vowel is found in the Irish name for this people, *Fir-Bolg*, and the hard guttural in Builc, the form which the name assumes in Nennius. MSS. of good repute give us the forms Volgae and Vulgae instead of Belgae, the reading generally adopted in Cicero's Oratio pro Fonteio (8. 16.); and Ausonius, himself a Gaul, tells us the Tectosagi were called, according to their primitive name, Bolcae, or, according to some MSS., Belcae (Clar. Urb. Narbo 13). But the great argument in favour of the identity of the two races rests on the testimony of Jerome. Jerome was a man whose early life, spent in the basin of the

[1] Mr. G. Long in Smith's Geogr. Dict.—*Volcae.*

Danube, was likely to make him attentive to peculiarities of dialect; he had dwelt at Treves, and must have often passed through Ancyra on his way to and from Palestine; and he tells us, in his preface to the Epistle to the Galatians, that the people of Ancyra spoke the same language as the men of Treves. All are agreed that the Tectosagi of Ancyra were the same people as the Tectosagi of Gaul, and therefore we must infer that the latter people spoke the same language as the men of Treves, or in other words as the northern Belgae. Identity of language in this case must mean identity of race, and the testimony of Jerome is to my mind decisive of the question.

In attempting to assign to the Belgae their proper place in the Celtic family, we shall follow a course somewhat different from that we have pursued with respect to the Ligures and Cimmerii, and begin with a reference to this people, which is found in a medieval writer. A fragment preserved by Nennius (c. 8) informs us that 'There is no certain history of the origin of the Scots. In Britain Historeth, son of Istorinus, with his people, got possession of Dalrieta; and Builc, with his people, got possession of the island Eubonia, and of others in that neighbourhood,' &c. From this passage we learn that Eubonia, which was the mediaeval name of the Isle of Man, was conquered by the Builc—for Builc is evidently a mere eponym of the conquering people. Now the Manxmen speak a dialect of the Gaelic, and we may therefore infer on the strength of this passage in Nennius that the Builc were a Gaelic people.

The usual name of this people in Irish is Firbolg, and it has been remarked with surprise that it is only the first part of this compound which undergoes the changes required by Irish syntax. The explanation is a simple one. The name Firbolg consists of two words. *Fir* is the plural of *Fear*, a man, and Firbolg really means the men of the Bolg—Bolg being an indeclinable name indicating the tribe. Consequently, when the laws of Syntax requires a change of case, it is only the first syllable *fir* that can

satisfy them. We have an instance of a syntax of this kind in Tigernach. Under the date 128 this Annalist informs us that a certain Irish king was slain 'a muig bolg,' i. e. in the plain of the Bolg, or in other words at the celebrated Tara.

As the conclusions these considerations point to are directly opposed to the views of continental scholars, and of that portion of our English writers who follow in their wake, it may be well to look on the question from other points of view, and see what shape it will take when seen under these new conditions. I believe an examination of the peculiarities which distinguish the ancient Celtic dialects will lead us to the very same conclusions as the historical authorities we have quoted.

One of the most striking peculiarities of the Irish dialects, as distinguished from the Welsh, is the use of the guttural instead of the labial; thus the Welsh *pump* five, *pedwar* four, *ep*[1] a horse, *map* a son, answer to the Irish *cing* five, *ceathair* four, *each* a horse, *mac* a son, &c. This letter-change seems to have been accepted by both races as a shibboleth, and from a very early period. When the Welsh missionaries introduced into Ireland the Welsh word *pasc* (Easter), their Irish disciples converted it into *caisg*; and on the other hand, when the Irish saint Kieran was received into the list of Cornish saints, he became St. Piran (Lanigan 2. 9). The Galli exhibited the same preference for the labial as the Welsh. Dioscorides (4. 42) informs us that the Galli called the cinquefoil 'pempedoula,' which is evidently a compound of the Welsh words *pump*[2] five, and *dail* leaves. Varro (A. Gellius, 15. 30) pronounced *petorritum*, the name of a kind of four-wheeled carriage, to be a Gallic word. In Welsh *pedwar*

[1] Vide le Pelletier's Dict. '*Ep*, selon que je l'ai appris de M. Roussel signifie un cheval; ce que nous avons appuyé par les composés *ebeul* et *kenep*.'

[2] The orthography of pempe-doula shows us that *pump* was in early Celtic a dissyllable, answering to the Greek *pempe*. As to the loss of the final vowel, vide p. 362.

is four, and *rhod* a wheel.[1] Again, when mentioning Eporedia, now Ivrea, in Piedmont, Pliny (3. 21) tells us that 'the Galli called good horse-breakers Eporediae' (Eporedicos?).[2] The Welsh *rhed* means a course, and the old Breton *ep* a horse, so that Ep-o-red must mean a horse-course, *o* being the connecting vowel; and Eporediae, the men of the Epored, or horse-course. That we have here the true etymology of the word is probable from the fact that Caesar calls a certain cavalry officer amongst the Galli Epored-o-rix, that is, chief of the Epored. Eporedia may have received its name originally because it was a great cavalry station, and was furnished with an *epored* for the exercise of the troops assembled there. The three words referred to—*pempedula*, *petorritum*, and *eporedia*—appear in the list of ancient Celtic words given by Camden; but to Mr. Garnett is due the credit of pointing out the historical inference that may be drawn from them.

A distinguishing peculiarity of the Gaelic is its use of the sibilant in cases where the Welsh dialects use the aspirate. Instead of the Welsh *halen* salt, *haf* summer *hen* old, *hesg* sedge, *hi* she, *hin* weather, *hil* offspring, *hir* long, &c., we have in the Irish *sailin*, *samh*, *sean*, *seisg*, *si*, *sion*, *siol*, *sior*, &c. There is reason to believe that the language of the Belgae was distinguished by the like sibilant peculiarity. According to the exaggerated statement of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 9. 17), 'The Silurus (sturgeon) in the Nile, the *Esox* in the Rhine, and the Attilus in the Po, sometimes reached 1000 pounds in weight.' Critics seem pretty well agreed that *esox*, gen. esoc-is, is the Cornish word *ehoc*, and the Breton and Welsh word *eog*, a salmon. The *esox* was in Roman times the subject of an

[1] There is no authority for a statement which has been made by more than one continental scholar, viz. that in modern Celtic *rit* means a wheel. In some dialects of *ancient* Celtic *rhod* may however have taken this form, for we occasionally find ancient Celtic names narrowing the vowel where we might least expect it. Dio Cassius for example always writes Allobriges for Allobroges.

[2] MSS. of good character read Eporedicos and Iporedicos. The received text has evidently been blundered.

extensive commerce. It appears to have been cured and pickled by the Belgic fishermen on the Rhine, and thence to have been transported, and to have carried with it its Belgic name, into every corner of the Roman empire. *Esoc-s*, when compared with *Ehoc*, shows that preference of the sibilant which is characteristic of the Gaelic. Again, there can be little doubt[1] that the Severn was the western boundary of the Belgic kingdom of Cunobelin, and that it is identical with the Irish word *sabhrann*, a boundary.[2] The Romans, when they conquered the island, appear to have adopted the Belgic name, and so to have called the river *Sabrina*; and the Welsh to have accommodated the Belgic name to the genius of their own language, and so to have given the river its present Welsh name of *Hafren*.

Another characteristic of the Gaelic is the very frequent rejection of *w* and its representatives. Thus the names of the Welsh king Cadwallon (Catguollaun in Nennius), of Tudwall, the Welsh king of Strathclyde, and of Oswy, the English king of Northumberland, appear in the Irish chronicles as Cathloen, Tothail, and Ossa. The British tribe called the Katuellanoi by Dio Cassius (957. 98), and on a Northumbrian inscription (as restored by Horsley) the Catavelauni, were no doubt the same people as the Belgic tribe whose capital Dur-o-Catalauni is now represented by Châlons-sur-Marne. I infer that Catalauni was the Belgic, and Catuvellauni the Welsh or Gallic mode of pronouncing the name. We find a like duplicity of names in the Rhone valley, and it admits I think of a like explanation. The people whom Ptolemy (2. 10) calls the Seggalaunoi are called by Pliny (3. 5) the Segovellauni. The latter I believe to be the pronunciation of the Gallic tribes in the Rhone valley, and the former the Belgic pronunciation of the Volcae. To take another example: Bede (Hist. Eccl. 4. 16) speaks of the Solent as the Sea 'which is called Solvente, in which the

[1] Vide Vol. II.

[2] The river Lee near Cork was in ancient times called Sabhraun, probably because it separated the two Irish tribes whose boundaries met in that neighbourhood.

two ocean tides which break forth round Britain from the boundless Northern ocean daily meet and conflict, &c., and when the conflict is over are poured back and return to the ocean whence they came.' This exaggerated account of the meeting of the tides reminds one of the *dou-rig-habren* or the two kings of Severn in Nennius (c. 72), or in plain English, of the account he gives us of the phenomena attending the *bore* in the Severn; and I have little doubt that Bede, who could have had no personal knowledge of the subject, drew his information relative to the tides in the Solent mediately or immediately from a Welsh source. On this hypothesis we can easily explain the origin of the term. The Breton *chal* means the incoming tide, and the Welsh *gwant* means a butt; by compounding these words we get *chal-want*, the butting or conflict of the tides. Now the Anglo-Saxon name is Solent-e, gen. Solent-an, and it is found in charters as old as the tenth century[1]. We cannot attribute the loss of the *w* to an English provincialism, for of all our dialects the one spoken on the shores of the Solent most affects this letter[2]. The only way in which I can account for the suppression of the *w* is by supposing that Bede's Solvente was taken from some Welsh MS., and exhibited the Welsh form of the name, while the men of Hampshire borrowed their name of *Solente* from the Belgic Britons they supplanted. In like manner our ancestors may have borrowed from the Belgae the Anglo-Saxon name for North Lincolnshire, viz. Lindisse; the Welsh name appears to have been Linuis (Nennius, c. 64).

The letter-change we have been discussing is not so satisfactory a test as the one we last considered, inasmuch as the *w* seems occasionally to have been dropped, even in some of the Welsh dialects; but in a case of cumulative evidence, whatever tends to strengthen the inference has its value.

Strabo tells us (4. 4. 3) that the Belgae called the thick woollen cloak they wore *lain-a*. This is evidently the Irish

[1] Cod. Dipl. 626. 1163.

[2] Hist. of Engl. Rhythms 2. 196.

word *leann*, a cloak. The initial liquid in Welsh is always *ll*, which Strabo would, there can be little doubt, have represented by *khl*, and as he must have had in his mind the Greek word *khlain-a*, a cloak, when he gave the Belgic word the form of *lain-a*, we may be pretty sure that the Belgic initial agreed with the Irish, and not with the Welsh initial. The inference to be drawn from this fact is weakened when we find that the Breton, like the Irish, uses the simple *l* as an initial; but we learn at least thus much, that the Belgae did *not* give the initial *l* that peculiar pronunciation which is so marked a feature of the modern Welsh.

Next to the letter-changes, one of the most searching tests of dialect is the way in which the meaning of words is modified by their affixes and suffixes. In Irish, *ard* is an augmentative affix, thus *athair* is a father, *ardathair* a patriarch, *sgoil* a school, *ardsgoil* a college, *righ* a king, *ardrigh* an emperor, &c. This augmentative affix is found in the Scotch Gaelic and the Manx, but there is nothing like it in the Welsh, the Breton, or the Cornish. I think, however, it may be shown that the ancient Belgae did use this affix, and for precisely the same purpose as the modern Irish. Caesar (B. G. 5. 3) gives the name of *Arduenna* to the great forest which stretched from Rheims to Tournay, and the remains of which are still called the Ardennes. Now the Manx *eaynagh* means a desert, a wilderness. *Agh* is the common adjectival ending in the Manx dialect, and is also used in that dialect to form substantives; thus from *Bretin*, Wales, we get the adjective *Bretin-agh*, Welsh, and also a substantive *Bretn-agh*, a Welshman; from *brain*, a hand-mill, *brain-agh*, grindery, a grinding-house, &c.; in like manner from the Irish *giubhas*, a fir-tree, we obtain *giubhs-ach*, a fir-wood, and from *beal*, a mouth, a hole, *beal-ach*, a gap, a way. From the analogy of these compounds we may, I think, infer that the Manx word *eayn-agh* was founded on an obsolete root *eayn*, a wood, and that it properly signified abounding in woods, and, when used as a substantive, a weald, a wilderness. That the old Belgic *en* or *hen* did

signify a wood is probable for another reason. Tacitus (Ann. 4. 73) speaks of a wood in the country of the Frisii called the wood of 'Baduhenna.' Baduhenna is considered by scholars to be the name of a goddess. If it be so, she must have been like our own Brigantia, a topical deity, and derived her name from the locality. Dutch antiquaries (Alting, Germ. Inf. 2. 30) fix 'the wood of Baduhenna' in a district of West Friesland, where are found the places called Holt-pade and Padeslo. It would seem the district was originally called Pade, and its woodland portion Holt-pade, i.e. Forest-Pade. On this hypothesis Bad-u-henna would signify the forest of Pade, as Ard-u-henna may signify the great forest[1], *u* being in both cases the connecting vowel.

Again, the Irish has a diminutive in *og*,—*busog*, a kiss, *bus*, a lip; *cabog*, a prater, *cab*, a mouth; *beadog*, a gossip, *bead*, trick, flattery; *ciarog*, a chafer, *ciar*, black; &c. In the Scotch-Gaelic the termination is *ag*,—*babag*, a tassel, *bab*, a tuft; *bacag*, a trip, *bac*, a hinderance; *beanag*, a little woman, *bean*, a woman; &c. These answer to our English diminutives in *ock*,—*hillock*, *bullock*, *lassock*, *bittock*, &c., and are evidently quite distinct from the Welsh diminutives in *ig*, which apparently answer to our diminutives in *y*,—*pussy*, *goody*, *deary*, &c. Now our antiquaries generally locate the station Durocobrivis near Fenny Stratford, on the lesser Ouse, called the Ousel, and Duroc-o-brivis means[2] literally 'on the banks of the Duroc,' or lesser water—*dwr* W., *dur* Ir., water. *Duroc* answers to the Irish and not to the Welsh diminutive, and was probably given to the lesser river by the Belgae, after their conquest and occupation of the district.

I would hope that the arguments I have advanced, historical and philological, will be considered as in great measure justifying the conclusion that the Belgae were

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus (27. 1) mentions a place called Calydon, which Walckenaer (Géog. 1. 516) would identify with Caldhoven near Thionville. Calydon may have been the Gallic name of the forest, and Arduenna the name it took after the Belgic conquest.

[2] See above p. 370.

a Gaelic race. Niebuhr, Thierry, and others, maintain that they were Cymry or Welshmen, and that the Galli proper were Gaels. But when we trace these notions to their origin, we find they rest almost entirely on the assumption that Gael was the same word as Gall-us, an unfortunate blunder on which I have already commented. The latest German author who has touched on these subjects is Mommsen, and he, strange to say, has for the most part adopted these views. But with singular inconsistency he also represents the Belgae, or at least the major part of them, to have been Teutons! This extraordinary notion is widely entertained by German scholars. It may therefore be necessary to examine the question of Belgic ethnology from another point of view, and to draw the line as well as we can, not between the Belgae and the Cymry, but between the Belgae and the Teutons. It will be found in this, as in the other case, that the blunder has arisen mainly from the misunderstanding of a phrase. We will first endeavour to settle the origin and history of the name Germani.

There is a passage in Tacitus (Germ. 2[1]) which has been differently interpreted by different scholars, but as the text is now generally received may perhaps admit of the following translation. 'The name Germania is recent, and but lately given to the country, for those who first passed the Rhine and drove out the Galli, and are now called the Tungri, were then called Germani, and the name by degrees prevailed as that of the people, and not merely as that of the tribe, so that all were called by the newly invented name, which was used first by the conquering tribe on account of the terror it excited, and afterwards by the people themselves.' Such was probably the meaning which

[1] 'Ceterum Germaniae vocabulum recens et nuper additum; quoniam, qui primi Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri tunc Germani vacati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paullatim, ut omnes, primum a victore, ob metum, mox a seipsis invento nomine, *Germani* vocarentur.'

Tacitus meant to convey to his readers, but the passage has come down to us in a corrupt state, and after all the manipulations it has undergone at the hands of successive editors still presents difficulties. One thing however is certain, that according to Tacitus the Tungri were called Germani when they crossed the Rhine and expelled the Galli. It is admitted that Tongres, west of the Meuse, was the capital of this people, and there cannot be a doubt that the tribes located in this neighbourhood were Celts. The notion that the name Germani signified war-men is trivial, and equally so is that which connects it with the Latin adjective *germani*, and makes it signify tribes *akin* to the Galli, though this was the favourite etymology of the classical writers (Strab. 7. 1. 2; Vell. Pater. 2. 67, &c). The passage I have quoted from Tacitus has led several modern writers to look on the name as Celtic. Zeuss (2. 735. 4) thinks it may mean the *neighbouring* tribes; but though the Irish *gar* means near to, yet this will account only for a small portion of the name, and moreover does not explain the terror which, according to Tacitus, it inspired. Others have suggested the Welsh *garm*, an outcry, as the root; but was there ever a people that derived a name from the shouts or yells they uttered? I venture to suggest a different etymology.

The Irish *garbh*, when used as a substantive, signifies warfare, when used as an adjective it has the meaning rough, boisterous, and nearly the same meaning is given to the derivative adjective *garbhan-ach*. *Ach* is the common Irish adjectival ending, but I do not find the root *garbhan* in any of our Gaelic dictionaries. There is, however, little doubt that it once existed as a distinct word, and its evident connection with *garbh* points to its meaning a rude rough man, a ruffian. We have repeatedly had occasion to observe how often the *b* of modern Celtic is represented by an *m* in the older dialect, and *garbhan* may well be the Gaelic representative of the Latinized phrase German-us. The name Germani seems to have been given by the an-

cient Celts to those tribes who followed 'the good old rule'

> 'That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.'

The tribes that bore this name held the same relation to the peaceable tribes round them, as the Highlanders to their Lowland neighbours a century ago.

The idea of rudeness was long attached in the Irish mind to the word *garbh*. In the historical romance called the Battle of Magh-Rath, the king of Saxony bears the name of Garbh mac Rogarbh—that is, Rough son of Veryrough, or, to vary the phrase, Ruffian son of Bigruffian. At an earlier period, this word and its cognates were hardly looked upon as conveying a reproach. In the time of Tacitus (Germ. 28), though they had tasted the sweets of Roman civilization, both Nervii and Treveri still affected a German descent; just as the tame Highlander in Scott's novel looked back with pride on the wild doings of his ancestors. Germanus was the name assumed by the Celt when he revolted against Roman supremacy. Commius the Atrebat, whom Caesar had once taken into his confidence, rose against Roman oppression when smarting under the sense of injury, and it was then no doubt the coins were struck, which bear the legend Commios Germanos, i.e. Commius the rebel, the outlaw. There were other Gallic chiefs who, as appears from their coins, at one time or other took up the same ominous title. They were all swept away as the tide of Roman ascendancy rolled over them.

At the still earlier period which preceded our aera, marauding tribes bearing the name of Germani seem to have been settled in the basin of the Rhone. Virgil (Ecl. 1. 63) calls the Arar (Saône) a German river[1]; Pliny (3. 23) represents the Alps as separating Germania from Italia; and Livy (21. 38) tells us that the passes of the Alps were occupied by 'half-German' tribes. Again, under a date which an-

[1] 'Aut Ararim Parthus bibet, aut Germania Tigrim.'

swers to B.C. 221, the Fasti Capitolini record the triumph of M. Claudius Marcellus over the 'Insubres and Germani.' There can be little doubt that the people here called Germani represent the Gaesati or Gallic mercenaries whom the Insubres brought to their assistance against the Romans. These mercenaries, Polybius tells us (2. 22), came under their kings Cogkolitanos and Anēroestos from the Alps and the Rhone, and the name of Gaesati imported that they were men who served for hire. The Irish *geis* means tribute, and it is in all probability the root of the name Gaesati[1], men who exacted payment for their services. The monument which has preserved the Fasti Capitolini dates only from the reign of Tiberius, but if, as is probable, the entries were copies of entries in the earlier Fasti we have here an instance of the use of the name Germani as early as the third century B.C.

There were also Germani in Spain. Ptolemy (2. 6) mentions a town called 'Orēton of the Germanoi,' and Pliny (3. 4) speaks of 'the Oretani who are also called Germani.' Most geographers locate Orēton at the eastern extremity of the basin of the Guadiana. These Germani may have been the descendants of certain Cimbri who were left behind when the main body retreated from the Peninsula in the year 104 B.C. Seneca alludes to the passage of the Pyrenees by these Germani: 'Asia claims the Tusci for its own; the Tyrians inhabit Africa; the Poeni Hispania; the Greeks intruded themselves into Gallia; the Galli into Graecia; the Pyrenees did not prevent the passage of the Germani[2]', &c.

Seneca probably thought this people to be the same race as the Germani beyond the Alps. He could hardly be thinking of the Teutonic tribes, for the application of the

[1] From *geis* comes the Irish substantive *geiseadh*, imposing of tribute, and perhaps *gaesat-i* may be formed on *geiseadh* as its root. But possibly the *at* may represent the Welsh ending *eaid*. If so, *gaesat-i* would range with such words as Cesar-iaid, the men of Cesar; Belg-iaid, the men of the Bolg, &c.

[2] Seneca, de Cons. ad Helv. 7.

name to *them* was a novelty even as late as the days of Tacitus.

When Caesar reached the Rhine, immediately before the great uprising of the Belgae, B.C. 57, he was told by the Rhemi that 'most of the Belgae were sprung *from the Germans*, and having crossed the Rhine in ancient times, settled there on account of the fertility of the country and drove out the Galli who inhabited those districts; and that they were the only people who in the past generation, when all Gaul was in trouble, prevented the Teutoni and Cimbri from entering within their borders, &c.' (B. G. 2. 4). We also learn that among the Belgic confederates, Galba, king of the Suessiones, had twelve towns 'and promised 50,000 armed men; the Nervii, who were accounted the fiercest of them all, and dwelt farthest off, the same number'; the Atrebates 15,000, the Ambiani 10,000, the Morini 25,000, the Menapii 9,000, the Caleti 10,000, the Velocasses and Velo-mandui as many, the Aduatuci 29,000; the Condrusi, Eburones, Caeraesi, Paemani, *who are called by one common name Germani*, were rated at 40,000. Caesar does not mention the Tungri, and the tribes last enumerated were probably those that went to make up the people to whom Tacitus gave that name.

Let us now see how far the topography of ancient Gaul will enable us to draw the line which separates the Teuton from the Celt on the Rhenish frontier.

The island enclosed within the two branches of the Rhine was inhabited by the Teutonic tribes, the Batavi and the Caninefates. According to Dutch scholars the Batavi were men of the Betuwe, a name still given to the district lying at the point where the two branches of the river separated. The word Betuwe, according to the same authority, signifies the good pasture; and in Kilian there is found an adverb *bat* or *bet* better, and a substantive *ouwe* or *auwe*, meadow or pasture land, so that Betuwe might signify the better pasture. I have never seen any explanation of the name Caninefates, though I think it admits of

a very easy one. The coasts of the island are protected from the sea by a belt of sandhills, which within living memory were swarming with rabbits. So rapidly were the tides eating away this loosely compacted but most necessary barrier, that some fifty or sixty years ago the terrified Hollanders destroyed these animals to prevent the mischief supposed to arise from their burrowing. Judging from the rate at which the width of the belt has been lessening in recent times, we may presume that in Roman times it was of great breadth, perhaps two or three miles broad, and as it must have been some seventy or eighty miles long, the rabbits were no doubt an important article of food, and their skins probably an article of commerce[1]. The Flemish *konijn* signifies a rabbit, and the Flemish *vatt-en* and Swedish *fatt-a* means 'to catch.' It is not unreasonable to conclude that the Canenfates[2] meant the rabbit-catchers or warreners that lived on the coast, and the Batavi the men who fed their cattle on the Betuwe or pasture-land on the eastern side of the island.

Now in the district thus confessedly Teutonic most of the names of places that have come down to us are Celtic. The name Batav-o-dur-um[3] must originally have meant the Betuwe-river, referring probably to the Lek, on the borders of which most geographers place Batavo-durum; Lug-dun-um[4] (Leyden) means the tower-fort; and Baduenna[5], which lies north of the island, the Pade-forest. I can only account for this mixture of Celtic and Teutonic names on the supposition that the Batavi were closely neighboured by Celtic tribes, from whom the Roman officials borrowed their topography of the district. In proceeding eastward we find no traces of a Teutonic nomenclature till we come to Cologne, where the Teutonic Ubii were settled in the reign

[1] The trade in rabbits—i.e., I presume, in rabbit-skins—between Spain and Rome is described as important (Strab. 3. 2. 6, p. 144).

[2] This name is written in MSS. Caninafates and Cannenafates—the latter was probably the more correct orthography.

[3] See p. 390. [4] See p. 358. [5] See p. 385.

of Augustus; and may perhaps infer that the Aduatici[1], who, according to Caesar (B. G. 2. 29), were descended from the Teutoni and Cimbri, were either altogether Celtic in origin or had lost their Teutonic characteristics among the Celtic populations by whom they were surrounded. On the great highway which led to Cologne from Treves were the following stations:—

Marcomago vicus	leugas VIII.
Belgica vicus	leugas VIII.
Tolbiaco vicus Supenorum	leugas X.
Agrippina civitas	leugas XVI.[2]

Marc-o-mag-us (March-plain) I take to be a station situated in the plain through which ran the march-dyke separating the district of Cologne from that of Treves. It must, however, have been some distance from the boundary dyke, for Belgica, the next station, eight leagues farther on, was in Belgian territory. The road probably ran towards the dyke slantingly, and crossed it somewhere between Belgica and the next station, which was undoubtedly Zülpich. The compound Marc-o-mag-us is like Batavodurum, a hybrid compound, and shows just as clearly the close neighbourhood of the two races.

It would appear, then, that as early as the third century B.C. there were certain races called Germani settled north of the Alps and in the upper district drained by the Saône. Some of these, like the Swiss, gave their military service to any one that was willing and able to pay for it, and in consequence received the name of Gaesati or mercenaries. These Germani were undoubtedly Celts. In the first century after Christ there were also Germani in Spain, and these, there can be little doubt, were descended from the Cimbri who invaded the peninsula in the second century B.C. Again, when Caesar invaded Gaul there were tribes known by the name of Germani, some of whom were Celts and

[1] The Aduatici were Cimbri both by nation and in character. Dio. Cass. 39. 4.

[2] Vide Itin. Antonini 'A Treveris Agrippinam,' no. 373.

others Teutons. As the Celtic tribes gradually threw aside their native rudeness and adopted the refinements of Roman civilization, the term appears to have been considered as indicating the barbarous races living beyond the Rhine, whatever might be their ethnography, and at last became a national name for the Teutonic races.

Thus far then we seem to have arrived at the following conclusions. At the beginning of the reign of Augustus the Belgae occupied that portion of 'the province' which lay between Toulouse and the Rhone, and the whole of Gaul north of the Seine and Marne. We have no proof that there were Teutonic tribes settled among them, and our only grounds for hesitation on the subject is our ignorance as to the origin of the three small tribes, the Nemetes, the Tribocci, and the Vangiones, and the possibility of their having been *some* admixture of Teutonic blood among the Aduatici. That portion of the Asiatic Galatai which acknowledged Ancyra for their capital were also Belgae and closely connected with the Volcae of Toulouse. These were the three great historical divisions of the Belgic race, but there were also Belgae settled in the basin of the Danube and possibly some even further northward. Whence came, then, this people, certainly Celtic in origin, but distinctly different from any other Celtic race with which history makes us acquainted? This is the question we have now to answer.

In the Irish version of Nennius the Belgae are called 'viri bullorum' (p. 44); and Dr. Todd, by way of explanation, points to the word *bullum*, which, according to Du Cange, signified a herdsman's crook. Dr. Todd mentions no circumstance which would render such a derivation a suitable one, and accordingly the etymology, as he puts it, has no historical basis to rest upon. I believe moreover that the phrase 'viri bullorum' is merely a blunder for 'viri bulgorum,' and that the latter was intended as a translation of the Irish phrase Firbolg—that is, the men of the Bolg. But erroneous as is Dr. Todd's

philology, he seems to have lighted by accident on the real meaning of the word. Before however we can give our reasons for the conclusion that the term Belgae meant the herdsmen, it will be necessary to explain the nature of the district from which we suppose them to have proceeded.

The steppes of southern Russia are wide open plains scantily supplied with water and utterly destitute of shelter. The rank vegetation that covers them in summer is grazed by countless herds of cattle, which are driven, as the winter approaches, either into the Crimea or to the banks of the Dnieper. So terrific are the wind-storms that sweep over the steppes at this season that neither man nor beast can stand against them; whole herds of cattle, we are told, are sometimes driven before the wind, and swept into the sea. With the milder weather the country becomes habitable, vegetation revives, and the cattle are again driven from their winter retreats to roam over the steppe. It is the opinion of Niebuhr that when the Skuthai invaded the Kimmerioi, the latter retreated across the Dnieper and reached Asia Minor by traversing the west coast of the Euxine and so passing the Bosphorus. I have given my reasons[1] for preferring the account of Herodotus, who leads them into Asia Minor by the east coast, but there are certainly grounds for the belief that a portion of the Kimmerioi escaped from the invaders by crossing the river. Those whose winter-home lay on the Dnieper would naturally retreat thither, and west of that river the civil commotion took place which led immediately to the emigration (Herod. 4. 11). It is therefore probable that while one portion of the Kimmerioi escaped from the Crimea by passing the Straits of Kertch, another portion escaped from the enemy by crossing the rivers Dnieper and Dniester.

It is a remarkable fact that the name of Belcae was given to certain Scythian tribes who occupied the steppes

[1] See p. 17.

after the expulsion of the Kimmerioi. Mela tells us (3. 5) that from the country of the Sarmatae 'Scythian races inhabit the confines of Asia, except where there is perpetual snow and unendurable cold, and they are almost all called by the common name of Belcae.' I believe it may be shown that this name Belcae signified the 'herdsmen,' and judging from its correlatives it seems to have been a term widely known in the neighbouring districts. Such an appellative may have been given to successive races, for the physical conditions of the country would necessitate the same mode of life whatever race inhabited the district. The herdsmen of the Kimmerioi may have carried the name with them when they crossed the Dnieper, and from them the name may have passed to the Latin geographers.

I have not, generally speaking, much faith in etymologies unless they are confirmed by history or are based on a large and careful induction. In endeavouring to fix the meaning of the word Belcae I shall be obliged to call the reader's attention to various terms that occur in Sanscrit and the related languages; and, that they may better range with the corresponding Greek and Latin words, I shall put the Sanscrit words into their nominatival form *palah*, *palakah*, &c. My examples will be taken from Wilson's Dictionary, which, as is well known, is founded upon native glossaries. A modern Sanscrit dictionary, which gives authorities for the different meanings, marks a great advance in Sanscrit lexicography, but for the purpose to which I shall apply it, Pundit authority, such as is used by Wilson, is amply sufficient.

It will be seen that the Sanscrit suffix has a double form, *palah* and *balah*; and that while the Greek prefers the initial *p*, the Latin takes the *b*. This illustrates a principle which I believe to be very important in language, and which I have elsewhere ventured to call parallelism[1]. It seems to me to open new views of language, and to group around it as mere corollaries 'laws' which it is difficult

[1] See above, p. 342.

otherwise to account for. I cannot here do more than glance at a subject which to discuss properly would require a separate chapter, or I might rather say a separate volume.

There is a Sanscrit adjective *pālah*, *pālī*, *pālam*, which signifies who or what guards or protects, and there are Sanscrit substantives *pal-ah*, a nourisher or protector, and *pālī*, a pot. In Sanscrit compounds the initial *p* alternates with *b*.

jā-bālah, a goatherd; *ajā*, a she-goat—the initial *a* being absorbed in the *j*.
kara-bālah, a sword; *karah*, the hand—literally the hand-protector.
gō pālah, a king; *gau-h*, the earth.
gō-pālah, a cowherd; *gau-h*, a cow.
ashwa-pālah, a groom; *ashwah*, a horse.
k'aṇḍa-pālah, a confectioner; *k'and-am*, molasses.
kanyâ-pālah, a girl's father; *kanyā*, a girl.
kshētra-pālah, a king; *kshētram*, the earth.
chakra-pālah, superintendent of a province; *chakr-am*, a province.
dwāra-pālah, a door-keeper; *dwār-am*, a door.
kapōta-pālî, a dovecot; *kapōtah*, a pigeon.

From pāl-ah comes pālak-ah, a cherisher, a protector, a guardian, a horse-keeper, a groom.

kula-pālakah, *ā* an adj.: providing for a family; *kul-am*, family.
ajā-pālakah, a goat-herd; *ajā*, a she-goat.
gō-pālakah, a cow-herd; *gau-h*, a cow.

In Greek the initial is *p*, and the short vowel is used instead of the long vowel.

ai-polos, a goat-herd; *aix* (*aigs*) a goat, the *g* being absorbed.
bou-polos, a neat-herd; *bou-s*, a neat.
huo-polos, a swine-herd; *hu-s*, a swine.
hippo-polos, one busied about horses; *hippos*, a horse.
nao-polos, a priest; *na-os*, a temple.
oiōno-polos, an aruspex; *oiōn-os*, a bird.
thalamē-polos, a bridegroom; *thalamē*, the chamber.

There are Greek compounds ending in pōlēs, but they are mere compounds of pōlēs, a dealer, and belong to a later period of the language than the compounds we are now dealing with. In Latin the initial is *b*.

thuri-bulum, the pot containing incense, *thus*, *thuris*, incense.
infundi-bulum, a hopper; *infundo*, to pour into.

sta-bulum, a stall; *stare*, to stand.
prosti-bulum, a brothel; *prostare*, to play the prostitute.
vesti-bulum, the recess before the house door. Every dwelling-house was considered as sacred to Vesta (Ovid, Fast. 6. 303).
cunā-bula, a cradle; *cunae*, id.

In the same language also were compounds answering to the Sanscrit compounds in pālakah.

bu-bulcus, a neat-herd; *bo-s*, a neat.
su-bulcus, a swine-herd; *su-s*, a swine.

I believe the name Bolg or Bolc was identical with this Latin ending bulc-us, and that it was used as a collective term to signify the herdsmen. Whether the name Bolc originated among the herdsmen or was given to them by their neighbours I cannot say—probably the former was the case, as the name seems to have followed the race into Gaul. Cognate terms however were used by the neighbouring tribes. More than one of the kings of the Daci bore the name Decebalus, and it was certainly not a proper name, but an appellative. Much speculation has been wasted on its 'etymology,' but the right analysis of the word points at once to its origin, Dece-bal-us, the Daci-prince (vide gō-pālah and chākra-palah). The dialect of the Daci must have been related to these languages, some of whose peculiarities we have been investigating; and it is probable that both the Daci and the neighbouring tribes were aware of the meaning of the name *Bolg*, and treated it as a mere appellative.

I venture, by the way, to call attention to a fact which throws light on a principle of language I have already more than once alluded to. The Sanscrit *go-pah*, like *go-palah* (p. 396), signifies a prince, and we may infer that the root *pa*, whence comes the nominatival form *pah*, must, like *pāla*, have once signified a protector, a prince. The Greek *ba* and Irish *fo* both signify a king, and it is not improbable that *pa*, *ba*, and *fo* are merely variant forms of the same root. In tracing the early roots of language we are constantly lighting upon terms thus bound together by some

letter-change. They seem to be among the earliest forms of language, and the letter-changes they illustrate and exemplify must, I think, be recognized as being the chief means employed in moulding the first developments of language. The reader will, I hope, agree with me in thinking that they have not yet received the attention they deserve.

In tracing the history of the various Belgic races we not unfrequently find the name Tectosages applied to them. It was borne alike by the men of Toulouse, by the Belgae living in the Hercynian forest, and by the men of Ancyra. The term must have been one of great antiquity. When we consider the life the Belgian herdsmen must have led on the Russian steppe, we may give a fair guess at its etymology. Those who have seen the modern French shepherd in the plains of Picardy leaning on his crook, not a hedge or a bush in sight, and the rain pouring down his heavy cape and thick belted over-coat, have probably seen a not unfair representative of his Belgian ancestor on the Russian steppe. Sagum was the name of a Gallic mantle, for the manufacture of which the Belgae of Gaul seem to have been famous (Strab. 4. 4. 3), and it was probably the same as the 'notable rugge mantle' which the Irish made out of their rough black wool down even to modern times. The Welsh *taith* means a journey, and *teith-awl* wayfaring; and as the Welsh melts down the guttural before a dental—as *wyth*, W. eight, *ocht* Ir.; *saith*, W. seven, *seacht* Ir.; *llaeth*, W. milk, *bliocht* Ir., &c., we may infer that in the Belgian, i.e. according to our hypothesis in an Irish dialect, *taith* might be represented by the first element of the name Tect-o-sag-es. As the Greeks called a tribe in the northern parts of Russia Melankhlainoi, or Black-cloaks, so the Kimmerioi may have given the name of Tectosages—i.e. men wearing the tect-o-sag, or wayfarer's sagum—to such of their countrymen as year after year drove the cattle to their pasture on the steppe.

Polybius (5. 77–78) calls a certain tribe, who appear to have been Belgae, Aigosages. Casaubon would alter Aigo-

sages into Tectosages. But the MSS. are against him. May not Aigosages be a *synonym* for Tectosages, and signify the men wearing the Aig-o-sag or goatskin sagum—*aix, aig-os*, a goat?

As Ptolemy (6. 14. 9) mentions a Scythian tribe called Tectosakes, it would seem that the appellative Tectosages, as well as Belcae (p. 395), was transferred from the Kimmerioi to the Skuthai who supplanted them.

We have discussed thus minutely the 'etymology' of the terms Belgae and Tectosages, in the hope of giving something like shape and reality to the *early* history of the races that bore these names. I would now call attention to the notices that have been preserved in Greek history, with reference to their later wanderings. These notices occur in detached and scattered passages, but they may be pieced together so as to give something like a continuous history of the people during the five centuries that immediately preceded our aera.

According to Livy (5. 34) there was a great emigration from Gaul in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus—that is, about the year 600 B.C. The movement was headed by Bellovesus and Sigovesus, sister-sons to Ambigatus, king of the Bituriges, who seems to have enjoyed a kind of supremacy at that time in Gaul. The auguries were taken and the lots cast; and Bellovesus, collecting followers from among 'the Bituriges, the Arverni, the Senones, Aedui, Ambarri, Carnutes, and Aulerci,' led them into Italy, where they played the part which has been already noticed[1]. Sigovesus, following the course allotted to him, led his people to the Hercynian Forest, but as to the fortune which there awaited him Livy is silent. Justin however (24. 4) informs us that this division of the emigrants proceeded to Illyricum, and there attacked the Pannonians and settled in their country. 'Pannonia' and 'the Hercynian Forest' were terms often used with much vagueness, and the emigration mentioned by Justin there can be little doubt was the one Livy has

[1] See p. 89.

recorded, as taking place under the leadership of Sigovesus The accounts in Livy and in Justin may not have been intentionally discrepant, though Justin certainly represents the emigration to Pannonia as having crossed the Alps. He probably confounded this emigration with the one into Italy of which he had just been speaking.

Justin tells us that after they had subdued the Pannonians, the emigrants 'waged various wars with their neighbours for many years,' and encouraged by their successes at last attacked Greece. It was doubtless the Celts who had thus settled in Illyricum and Pannonia that sent an embassy to Alexander when he advanced to the Danube 335 B.C. Strabo (7. 3. 8) calls them 'the Keltoi on Adria,' and Arrian (1. 4) calls them 'the Keltoi dwelling on the Ionian Gulf'; the former quotes as his authority Ptolemeus, son of Lagos, i.e. the first of the Egyptian Ptolemies, who we know wrote an account of Alexander's campaigns. Between the emigration of these 'Keltoi' under the conduct of Sigovesus and their thus coming into contact with Alexander more than two centuries must have elapsed. The time may have been occupied in those various wars with their neighbours that Justin refers to. Their history during the three centuries that immediately preceded our aera may be traced more satisfactorily.

About the year 281 B.C., when Pyrrhus was meditating the invasion of Italy (Polyb. 2. 21) the Gauls began those inroads into Greece which for some years made them conspicuous in Greek history. Pausanias (10. 19. 4) styles the leader of the first inroad Kambaules, and represents the second as being under the guidance of different leaders. He mentions Kerethrios as marching against the Thrakes and Triballoi, Brennos and Akikhorios as marching against Paionia, and Bolgios against the Makedones and Illurioi. It was the last chief who in the year 279 B.C. met and defeated Ptolemy Keraunos, king of Macedonia (Paus. 10. 19. 4). The third army was led by Brennos, Akikhorios, and other chiefs, and is said to have consisted of 150,000

footmen and 20,000 horsemen, or rather we should say of 60,000 horsemen, inasmuch as each horse-soldier was accompanied by two armed followers mounted like himself—an arrangement which was termed *trimarkisia* (Paus. 10. 19. 6). Brennos advanced against Delphi, and after his repulse a portion of his army settled near Byzantium, under the leadership of Leonorius and Lutarius (Livy 38. 16) and other leaders, among whom Polybius (4. 46) mentions Comontorius. Tempted by the intestine feuds which prevailed in Bithynia, some of these chiefs crossed the Bosphorus and led the way to that migration into Asia, which after a long career of rapine and violence ended in the establishment of the kingdom of Galatia.

There can be no doubt that the invading armies consisted of different races—Kymric and Belgic—though it is not easy to say to which of these two races any particular body of the invaders belonged. Brennus is the latinized form of Bran, which was long used as a proper name by the Welsh, and was the root of the Irish word *brain-e*, a chief, and of the Welsh word *brenin*, a king. As Brennus was the name of the Gaulish chief who took Rome 390 B.C., we have grounds for the conclusion that the body of invaders which was led by Brennus and Akikhorios were Cymry; and the inference is strengthened by their use of the phrase *trimarkisia*, inasmuch as in Welsh *tri* is three, and *march* a horse, and I do not remember any word answering to *march* in Gaelic. The name of Bolgios would lead me to infer that the people this chief led were Belgae, and I would draw a similar inference with respect to the followers of a chief named Cavarus, who exercised a certain dominion near Byzantium (Pol. 8. 24), as we have reason to believe that the Cavari were a Belgic tribe. Justin (32. 3) represents the Tectosages of Toulouse as having acquired their wealth by the sack of Delphi. In this statement he was probably mistaken, but we may gather that Justin, or rather his authority Trogus Pompeius, believed that Tectosages, that is Belgae, took part in the attack on the sanctuary at Delphi.

The Cymry who settled in Illyricum and Pannonia left Gaul before their countrymen had accepted the name of Celtae[1], and ages before the Romans imposed on them the name of Galli[2]. When they invaded Greece they were probably known only by their tribal names, and had no common name by which the Greeks might recognize them as a distinct nationality. Their allies, wherever they wandered, seem to have used the terms Galatae and Belgae as their peculiar titles, and so important was the part played by these allies, that their name of Galatai seems to have rivetted the attention of the Greeks, and so to have been adopted by them as a general name for the Celtic race. The name of Galatai is used in this general sense by Timaeus, who probably wrote in the latter half of the third century B.C., for his history comes down to the year 264 B.C.; and by Callimachus in his hymn to Delos (184), which could hardly have been written later. The name, however, never passed into Roman usage, just as the Roman name of Galli was never adopted by the Greeks.

In the well-known inscription found at Olbia near the mouth of the Borysthenes (Dnieper), the Galatai are mentioned as one of the most formidable enemies of the Greek colony. The date of the inscription has been the subject of controversy, but it is generally assigned to some period about the year 200 B.C. From the way they are alluded to, it would seem that the Galatai were a tribe settled somewhere west of the Dniester—that is, in the very district in which we might expect the fugitive Kimmerioi to take refuge. Of the origin of the name I am ignorant; but the Welsh gave the name of Galeddin to certain British tribes, which were certainly of Belgic origin. The Triads describe the Galeddin as one of the 'Tribes of Refuge,' who were driven from the land of Pwyl by an inundation of the sea, and allowed to settle in the Isle of Wight. As the inhabitants of the Isle of Wight were certainly Belgae, we may

[1] See p. 36.

[2] See p. 38.

reasonably infer, that the Galeddin were a Belgic people. Again, in another Triad, one body of the British emigrants to Gaul in the third or fourth century are said to have come from Arllechwedd Galeddin. There can be little doubt that Arllechwedd Galeddin was the name of the district lying between Bath and Ilchester, and it probably took the addition of Galeddin to distinguish it from the other Arllechwedds that were found in Britain. Now this district was the very heart of the country belonging to the Southern Belgae, and I think we must conclude either that the Galeddin were a tribe of Belgae, or that Belgae was a tribal name of the people whose national name was Galeddin or Galatai.

When the invading tribes passed over into Asia, they seem to have gathered round them many of the loose and wandering tribes they met with in their progress. The Phrygians, in whose country they finally settled, were an ancient people. The townsmen of the district were devoted to a degrading superstition, and though they retained traces of an effete civilization, had lost all the manlier qualities of their race. But the men who roamed over the wide plains around them must, from the very nature of their calling have been of a different character. Like the ruder classes in other countries they long retained the original name of their race, and the 'Togarmah,' who with 'Gomer' traded horses in the markets of Tyre[1] were no doubt faithfully represented by their descendants the 'Trocmi,' who joined the invaders in the third century B.C. All the letter-changes which are necessary to convert Togarmah into Trocmi can be explained satisfactorily; and all the circumstances of the case point as strongly to identity of race as to identity of name. There must have been much more in common between the rough-coated Tectosages of Ancyra, and the wandering Trocmoi, than between these latter and the Phruges of classical history, and so we can understand how the former came so readily to change their nationality

[1] Ezek. 27. 14.

and to coalesce with the strangers that were settled at Ancyra. The ethnology of the third Galatian tribe—the Tolistoboii, is extremely obscure; and as it is doubtful whether the results obtained will repay the labour of investigating it, I shall not pursue the subject.

In these inquiries I have assumed that the invasion of the Kimmerioi left traces behind it in Asia Minor, which had not entirely disappeared when the Galatae invaded the district, some 300 years afterwards. I believe circumstances justify this conclusion. Historians have not given to the Kimmerian invasion the importance that was due to it. They seem to have looked upon it as a passing evil, like the invasion of the Skuthai; but in fact the Kimmerioi remained in the country devastating and pillaging it for one or two centuries. One of their tribes, called the Treres or Trerones, particularly distinguished themselves by their excesses. 'The Kimmerioi, whom they also call Trerones, or some branch of them, overran the right side of Pontos and the parts adjacent, sometimes falling on the Paphlagones, and sometimes on the Phruges, when Midas drank the bull's blood and died. Lygdamis led his people as far as Lydia and Ionia, and took Sardes, but perished in Kilikia. Oftentimes the Kimmerioi and Treres made incursions of this kind, but they say that the Treres and Kobos were at last expelled by Madus king of the Kimmerioi.' (Strabo 1. 3. 21, p. 61.) We have already alluded to the people called the Treres (vide p. 88), and suggested that the name may be the same as the Gaulish name Treveri. They seem to have been settled in Thrace, and were probably a branch of the fugitive horde which fled from the Skuthai over the Dnieper and the Dniester (vide p. 394). At a later period this people may have furnished contingents to the army that attacked Delphi, but whether they joined in the tide of invasion which afterwards poured into Asia I cannot say. It is by no means unlikely that they were mixed up in that medley of races which went to the composition of the people known as the Galatae of Asia.

We have argued that the Tectosages of Ancyra were a Belgic people, inasmuch as they spoke the same language as the Belgae of Treves (vide p. 379), and we have given reasons for the conclusion, that the Volcae Tectosages of Toulouse were Belgae likewise. According to Caesar (B.G. 6. 24), there were in his day Volcae Tectosages settled in the districts adjoining to the Hercynian forest. He praises their warlike qualities, but represents them as living, like the Germani, in a state of degradation and poverty. It is a reasonable inference that both the European and the Asiatic Tectosages were descended from this intermediate people. It is true Caesar assumes that the Hercynian Tectosages came from Toulouse, but it was the practice of his time to derive the obscurer tribes from those which were better known and more important. We have had frequent occasion to notice how this kind of historical criticism has interfered with the truth of history. The fact, that the name of Galatai was borne alike by tribes living in the Hercynian district and at Ancyra, goes far to show, that the same people was living in both localities.

After the repulse from Delphi we know that the invading army separated under different leaders. One body, as we have seen, settled in Thrace; another, the Skordiskoi, settled in the country where the Drave joins the Danube; and there may have been others, whose wanderings are not recorded. Among the wanderers westward I believe we must rank the Volcae of southern Gaul. At an earlier period they could hardly have occupied the countries in which the Romans found them, or we should have met with the name, in some of the many notices which have come down to us relative to Marseilles and its early struggles as a colony. The Allobroges were settled south of the Rhone in 212 B.C., when Hannibal advanced against Italy, and from the position of the district they occupied they must have followed the Volcae in the migration westward. The name Allobroges is a Welsh word, and signifies strangers (p. 357). In 212 B.C. it must have been a mere appellative, and

denoted a recently arrived people, for it could not have been used as a *proper name,* till history had put its stamp upon it, and it was not till the Romans came into contact with them that the Allobroges were known to history. I would say therefore that the Volcae made their first appearance in Gaul between the years 279 B.C. and 212 B.C., and probably not long after the earlier date.

The vast quantity of the precious metals that was found hoarded in the temples, and in the sacred lakes of Toulouse, when the Romans captured the place, passed into a proverb. The town was situated close to a gold-producing district (Strab. 4. 1. 13), and we may account for these treasures without adopting Justin's view, that they were the spoils carried away by the Tectosages from the sack of Delphi. It is by no means unlikely that some of the men that plundered Greece were among those who settled at Toulouse, but it was the same kind of criticism which led Caesar to bring the Tectosages of the Hercynian district from Toulouse, that led Justin to bring the invaders of Greece from that locality. The Tectosages may have gone from Greece to Toulouse, but certainly not from Toulouse to Greece.

The Belgae of northern Gaul were no doubt later immigrants than their countrymen the Volcae, but owing to the longer time they retained their independence, they fill a much more important place in history. For more than two centuries they were enlarging their boundaries and strengthening their position. When the Cimbri advanced against Italy they were the only tribes in Gaul that prevented these strangers from penetrating within their territory, and before the year 100 B.C. they had established themselves in Britain. In following their migrations we are thus brought within sight of the island whose early history we are endeavouring to illustrate. Here then we have a well-marked and natural division of our subject. Further investigations may be postponed till we enter upon a new volume.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

On the Arrangement of Chapters IV, V, VI, VII, and X.

In order to elucidate the original plan of Dr. Guest's Fourth Chapter, subsequently divided and rearranged in Chapters IV, V, VI, VII, and X, it is thought desireable to print the summary prefixed to his first draught, with reference to the pages at which the matter afterwards rearranged will be found in the present Edition.

The military races, p. 103. Our knowledge of them derived mainly from the Bible narrative, p. 104; objections to its credibility considered, p. 104. Antiquity of man, p. 104. The creative days, p. 113. The deluge, p. 116. Subsidences of the earth's surface, p. 119. Story of the Atlantis, p. 119. Migration to Shinar, p. 128. Confusion of tongues, p. 129. Eber (Melchizedek) departs from Shinar, p. 129. Father of the Joktanite Arabs, p. 130; his connexion with the Philistines and other ancient races dwelling around him, p. 131. Palestine and its neighbourhood known to the Philistines as the land of the Ibrim and the Holy Land, p. 144; may have obtained both names as being the seat of this great patriarch, p. 145. Canaan the earliest trader, p. 147; settled first on the southern Euphrates, afterwards on the Mediterranean, p. 148; curse pronounced on him, p. 150. Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, p. 174. The Cushite districts of the Kossaioi, the Zimri and the Hamitic settlers in Sheba and Dedan, pp. 176, 329–333. The Egyptian settlements Anamim, Pathrusim, Ludim, Caphtorim, etc., p. 177. The children of Shem: Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram, p. 183; the districts they occupied, ib. The Chaldees, their origin,

p. 162. The races descended from Abraham, p. 166. Bene Kedem, Ishmaelites, p. 167. Hagarenes, ib. Nabatheans, p. 168. Edomites, pp. 169, 187. Origin of the terms Eruthraioi, Phoinikes, &c., p. 153. The names Suroi, Leuko-Suroi, &c., p. 191. The terms Suroi and Aramaioi treated as synonyms by the later Greeks, p. 193. The Ereb or 'mingled people,' the same as the Rebu of Egyptian history and the Eremboi of the Odyssey, p. 195. The Ereb of the desert, p. 196. Lud, according to Arabian tradition, the father of the Amalekites, p. 199. The Mehunim or Maon, p. 179. The Amalekites called Makedones in the Septuagint, p. 201. The same people as the Hykshos, p. 199. The Hykshos or Shepherd-kings who invaded Egypt, ib. The Solumoi of Asia Minor, a Shemitic people, p. 200; dressed their hair in a sisoē, ib. Same mode of dressing the hair prevalent among the Hittites and other nations bordering on Palestine, p. 201 (304). The Amalekites and Geshurites among the most ancient races of Palestine, p. 201; whence descended, p. 202. The Amalekites in certain localities called Maacath, ib.; whence the name of Makedon found in the Septuagint, p. 201. The Maon, or Mehunim, an Amalekite people, the same as the Magan of the Assyrian inscriptions, p. 202. The Lud, Maon, and Maacath settled round Palestine, the same people as the Ludoi, Meōnes, and Makedones of Lydia, p. 205. The mythus of Osiris symbolizes the progress of Egyptian culture rather than of Egyptian conquest, p. 205. The story of Sesostris made up of legends relating to the conquest of various Egyptian Pharaohs, p. 208. The mythus relating to Typhon, ib. The expulsion of the Shepherds, the Exodus of the Israelites, and the defeat of the 'peoples of the Sea' seem to have been confounded together by Manetho, p. 209; hence probably the late date ascribed by Rabbinical writers to the Exodus, p. 210. Ahmes the first Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty, the Pharaoh that expelled the Shepherds, p. 210, and Tothmes II, probably the Pharaoh of the Exodus, p. 211. Zoan, an entrenched camp adjoining

Avaris, constructed by the Hykshos king for the annual gatherings of his people, p. 212. Our knowledge of early chronology rests mainly on two dates, that of the call of Abraham, and that of the Exodus, p. 318. The genuineness of 1 Kings 6. 1, and of Gen. 15. 13 considered, p. 320. St. Paul's statement, Gal. 3. 17, reconciled, p. 324. Account of Moses' parentage, Exodus 6. 20, not inconsistent with the 400 years of sojourn in Egypt, p. 316. The 450 years ascribed to the period of the Judges, explained, p. 325. Dr. Hales on the longer scheme of chronology, p. 323. Mr. Stuart Poole's very ingenious attempt to support it, p. 322. Difficulty of fixing the *actual* date of any event in early history, p. 325. Zoan built seven years after Hebron, which was probably built not long before Sarah's death, and according to Josephus about the 22nd century B.C., p. 327. Abraham went to Egypt before the Hykshos invasion, p. 328; during his sojourn in Canaan the Elamites were dominant on the Euphrates in the 23rd century B.C., p. 328. The supremacy of the Elamites probably followed by that of the Chaldees or the Nahorites, about the year 2000 B.C., p. 330; by that of the Kassi, or Kossaioi, a few centuries later, and lastly by that of the Assyrians, p. 333. The Kassi the same people as the Kossaioi of the classical geographers, and the Cush mentioned in the description of Eden (Gen. 2. 13), p. 332. The dynasties of Berosus, p. 319. The three languages used in the Achaemenian inscriptions, probably those of the three great dominant races, namely the Medes and Persians, the Assyrians, and the Kassi, or Kossaioi, p. 332. The origin of the two ancient races, the Accadi and the Sommari unknown, p. 333. The phrase 'the four languages,' equally ancient, and its meaning unknown, p. 333.

END OF VOL. I.

[illegible] p. 382